00037271

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 03 December, 2015

VV H 4
39271

A

HISTORY

OF THE

POLITICAL LIFE

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE

WILLIAM PITT;

INCLUDING SOME ACCOUNT OF

THE TIMES IN WHICH HE LIVED.

By JOHN GIFFORD, Esq.

IN SIX VOLUMES.

NEC TIBI, SED TOTI GENITUM SE CREDERE MUNDO.

LUCAN.

Vv-k 4

VOL. III.

37271

London:

PRINTED FOR T. CADELL AND W. DAVIES,

STRAND.

1809.

1704
973.073
Gi4h
37271

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER XVI.

Effects of Mr. Fox's declared approbation of the French Revolution---Approaching Schism in the Opposition---Fruitless endeavours to avert it---Declaration of abstract Principles contended to be no ground of dissension---Mr. Burke entertains a different opinion---His apprehensions of danger from French Principles shewn to be well-founded---Character of his "*Reflections on the Revolution in France*."---Resolves to defend that book against the attacks of Mr. Fox in the House of Commons---Communicates his resolution to Ministers, and to Mr. Fox himself---Mr. Sheridan moves the re-commitment of the Canada Bill after the Easter Recess---Some Members of the Opposition deprecate all reflections foreign from the immediate subject of discussion---Unparliamentary conduct of Mr. Taylor in anticipating a disorderly debate---Mr. Fox denies any statement of Republican Principles as applied to *this* Country---Adheres to his former declarations on the subject of France---Mr. Burke asserts the necessity of referring to other Constitutions in discussing the merits of a new Constitution---Avows his intention of discussing certain Principles of Government in the future Debates on the Bill,---and declares his readiness to sacrifice his friendship for Mr. Fox to the Love of his Country---Royal Message on the Russian Armament---State of the

Cause between Russia and the Porte---Negotiations for a Peace opened between the powers---The Empress Catharine rejects the proffered mediation of Great Britain and Prussia---Her hostile spirit towards Great Britain---Her ambitious views on Poland, and on Turkey---Mr. Pitt resolves to counteract those views---Mr. Hawkesbury moves an Extraordinary to afford the Negotiations for Peace---Mr. Pitt moves the Address to the Throne on the message---Explains the motives and the policy of the proposed Measure---The Motion opposed by Mr. Fox, who takes a very contracted and unfair view of the Question---He is answered by Mr. Pitt---Motion carried---The Subject revived by Mr. Grey, who calls upon the House to adopt resolutions disapproving the very Address which they had recently voted---Contends that the conquest of Turkey, by Russia, would be beneficial to mankind---Displays the spirit of the ancient Crusaders---Mr. Pitt observes a profo[illegible]ce on the Question---Their opposite effects on the pernicious and ruinous Effects of the Russian System of Policy---Mr. Sheridan reprobates the French Revolution, and bespeaks perpetual Peace with [illegible]---Mr. Grey's Resolutions rejected by a majority of eighty---Fresh discussion on the same topic introduced by Mr. Baker---Mr. [illegible] Motion, for Ministers to forfeit the confidence of the Country, [illegible]---Mr. Fox pronounces a splendid eulogy on the new Constitution of France---Motion of the House rejected by a majority of ninety-four---A fourth debate on the Subject, on the motion of Mr. Thomas Grenville, which is rejected by a majority of ninety-four---Discussions under which the Ministers laboured during these debates---Mr. Fox's inability to communicate all the motives of his Conduct---Reflections on the Conduct to be observed by Ministers---Mr. Fox sends Mr. Adair to St. Petersburgh, as his Representative,

to thwart the designs of his Majesty's Ministers, and to frustrate the Endeavours of his Majesty's Envoy---Mr. Burke's account of that Transaction, aptly characterized as a High Treasonable Misdemeanour---Favourable reception of Mr. Adair at the Russian Court---Effects of this unconstitutional Embassy---The Empress makes Peace with the Porte on her own Terms—Renewed discussions on the Canada Bill---Mr. Burke's Speech---His Analysis of the new "Rights of Man."---Contrasts the French Constitution with the British---Depicts the misery of the French Colonies from the Importation of the New Principles---Is called to order---Is supported by Mr Pitt---Lord Sheffield moves that dissertations on the French Constitution are disorderly---Mr. Fox seconds the Motion ---Mr. Pitt declares Mr. Burke to have spoken strictly in order---Mr. Fox attacks Mr. Burke; taxes him with Inconsistency, and reminds him that they had both deplored the death of American Rebels---Remarks on this and other parts of Mr. Fox's Speech---He is answered by Mr. Burke, who disclaims the motives imputed to him, ---Exposes the fallacy of Mr. Fox's arguments, and the duplicity of his Conduct---Describes the future Effects of the French Revolution---His Patriotism praised---His impressive exhortations to the two great Political Rivals---Mr. Fox replies---Mr. Burke rejoins---Adverts to the Proceedings of the seditious Societies in England---Mr. Pitt closes the discussion, by recommending Lord Sheffield's Motion to be withdrawn, and expresses his gratitude to Mr. Burke for his eloquent defence of the Constitution---Further discussion of the Canada-Bill---Mr. Fox *modifies* some of his former opinions respecting an *Aristocracy*---Remarks of Mr. Pitt---Answer of Mr. Burke---Reflections on their respective Sentiments---Radical difference of Principle, independent of the French Revolution, between Mr. Burke and Mr. Fox---Generous Conduct of Mr. Pitt---Prorogation of Parliament.

CHAPTER XVII.

The progress of Revolutionary Principles in England—Paine's Rights of Man—Means taken to promote its extensive circulation among the lower classes of People—Its Effect—The Revolution Society—Justice of Mr. Burke's charges against it, proved from the contents of its own publications—Its abuse of Princes—Its wishes for the example of France to be imitated in all countries—Dr. Priestley—His admiration of the French Revolution—His wish for the extirpation of the Established Church, whose clergy he reviles as "Vermin who deserve no mercy"—Anticipates the destruction of Kings, Archbishops, and Bishops—Resolves to commemorate the seizure of the Bastille at Birmingham—Seditious handbill circulated on that occasion—The mob insult the commemorating Patriots—Demolish the house of Dr. Priestley—Commit other outrages—Are dispersed on the arrival of the troops—These riots produced by a seditious handbill—Reward offered for the discovery of the Author—The Author absconds, but his guilt is known—Dr. Priestley's losses on this occasion—Are made good by the Hundred—Destruction of his philosophical apparatus—Address to Society—Philosophical lamentations of the Doctor—Echoed by the Students at Hackney College—And by the Unitarian Preachers—Pernicious tendency of his writings—He injures his country, and betrays an Ancient friend, after sending his son to become a citizen of France—Injustice of his complaints—Rejection of the constitutional tenets of the Unitarians—Fifth—Fifteenth article—Tyranny of the National Assembly—All freedom of debate destroyed—Indecent conduct of the galleries—Persecution of the non-juring priests—Consecutive examples of Louis XVI.—Bishop of

Clermont's letter to his Majesty on the subject of receiving the Sacrament at Easter—The King is insulted by a grenadier, while at chapel—Attempts to go to St. Cloud with his family—Is stopped by the mob—Appeals for protection to La Fayette—La Fayette's fruitless endeavours to disperse the populace—The King is obliged to return—Repairs to the National Assembly—Dastardly Conduct of its Members—The King resolves to escape from Paris—Mirabeau is gained over to the court—His project for restoring the regal authority—La Fayette suspects him—Curious conference between them—Death of Mirabeau—Sketch of his character—Emperor of Germany's advice to Louis XVI.—Indecision of the King—His extreme imprudence—He leaves Paris for Montmedy—Is arrested at Varennes, and compelled to return to Paris—The prevalence of republican principles—The King a prisoner in his Palace, with La Fayette for his gaoler—All regal power usurped by the Assembly—Firm conduct of the Royalists—The Sovereign attacked in the Assembly by Petion—Who proposes a measure subversive of a fundamental principle of the new constitution—Furious speech of Brissot in the Jacobi Club—The King accepts the constitution and swears to observe it—The Assembly is dissolved—Conference at Pilnitz—Object of it—Declaration of Austria, Prussia, and the French Princes—Never carried into effect—Objectionable passage in the declaration—Remarks upon it—The British Government take no part in those proceedings—Motives of Mr. Pitt's conduct—His high ideas of National Independence—Is not yet alive to the danger of revolutionary principles—Is sincerely anxious for the preservation of Peace—Mr. Burke's exposition of French Principles—State of the public mind in England and France at the close of 1791.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Opening of the Session of Parliament—Speech from the Throne—Motion for the Address opposed by Mr. Fox—Applies to himself a passage in the Speech—Condemns the interference of Government in the negotiation between Russia and the Porte—Is supported by Mr. Grey—Answered by Mr. Pitt—Accompanies the failure of that interference to the state of Opposition—Mr. Pitt opens the budget for the year 1792—Prosperous State of the Finances—Proposes the repeal of the taxes on female servants, on coals and sea-coals; on small houses, and on candles—His plan for the investigation of the causes of National Prosperity—Debate on this Subject—Motion for the gradual abolition of the Slave Trade carried—New System of Police introduced—Discussion on the subject; its beneficial effects demonstrated by experience, in the diminution of the number of capital punishments—Society of [illegible] in consequence of some of its Members—[illegible] to [illegible] a plan of procuring a reform in Parliament—[illegible] a member of this Society, [illegible] on the House of Commons proposed to be made in the next Session for a Parliamentary Reform—Mr. Pitt [illegible] Mr. Fox [illegible] Deprecates the discussion of [illegible] Declares his sentiments on the question—Avows a change in [illegible]—Explains the cause of [illegible]—Opposes his [illegible] with [illegible] of innovation—Is answered by Mr. Fox, who vindicates the New Society—[illegible] by Mr. Burke and Mr. Windham—Approved by Mr. [illegible]—Danger of such attempts at this period—Democratic Spirit—The people neither [illegible] nor the only [illegible] of power, and the only legitimate

founders of Government---Consequences of this doctrine, as applied to the British Monarchy---System of representation rectified, and the House of Commons libelled---Similar opinions advanced by another writer on the French Revolution---Appearance of the second part of Paine's Rights of Man---The London Corresponding Society---Dissemination of dangerous principles---Mr. Pitt's repugnance to coercive measures---Cause of that repugnance---Is subdued by the very principle which gave birth to it---He resolves to issue a proclamation against the seditious Societies---Copy of it previously shewn to the leaders of the Wig Party---Mr. Fox's motion in favour of the Unitarians---Supported on abstract principles---Opposed by Mr. Burke, who reprobates such a mode of argument---Points out the dangerous principles and conduct of the Unitarians---Comments on their proceedings at a late meeting---Remarks on the speech of Doctor Towers at the Unitarian meeting---Mr. William Smith avows himself an Unitarian, defends the Society, declares them to be unconnected with all other Societies, and pronounces them to be the firm friends of Government---The motion opposed by Mr. Pitt---Rejected by the House---Mr. Whitbread's motion on the Birmingham riots---His panegyric on the Dissenters---His censure of the Magistrates---Mr. Dundas answers him, and exculpates the Magistrates---Motion rejected---Object of the motion---Mr. William Smith's assertions, respecting the Unitarians disproved by authentic documents---Chauvelin's letter---Correspondence with Lord Grenville on the King's Proclamation---Falsehood of Mr. Chauvelin's statement demonstrated---Is properly reproved by Lord Grenville---Debate on the Proclamation in the House of Commons---Address---Opposed by Mr Grey, who proposes an Amendment---Proclamation condemned by the Opposition---Mr. Grey's virulent invective against Mr. Pitt---Treated with contempt by the Minister---Address supported by Lord North, and other members of the Whig Party---Carried---

Debates on the same Subject in the Houses of Lords—Speech of the Prince of Wales in support of the Address—The Duke of Portland, Lord Spencer, and other Peers of the same Party, join with the Ministers—The Lords dissent to the Address—Mr. Pitt's views for an Union of Parties—Strange conduct of Lord Thurlow in the House of Lords—Passes Mr. Pitt's Revenue-Bill, and abuses the Petitioners of it—Opposes the New Forest Timber-Bill—Changes the Ministry, with having betrayed their Sovereign—Is answered by Lord Grenville—Mr. Pitt's representation to the King—Parliament prorogued—The Great Seal taken from Lord Thurlow—Mr. Pitt makes overtures to the leaders of the Whig Party—They fail through the arrogant pretensions of Mr. Fox—Remarks on Mr. Fox's conduct on this occasion—State of the Ministry—Political character of Lord Thurlow.

CHAPTER XIX.

Unsettled state of the Continent—Affairs of Poland—Salutary changes in her Constitution—Patriotic conduct of the King, and of the first Orders of the state—Approved by Prussia and Austria—Condemned by Russia—Arrival of a French Envoy at Warsaw—Consequent confusion—Checked by the sentiments of Austria and Prussia—Cause of the Empress Catharine—Difference between the Polish and the French Revolutions—Falsehood of the Russian Declaration exposed—Confuted by the Poles—A Russian Army enters Poland—The new Constitution passed—Medal of the King of Sweden—Death of Prince—Sketching of the new Constitution—Proposal to liberate the Catholics—Impolicy of the Irish Assembly—Its Consequences—Composition of the Legislative Assembly—Views of the Constitutionists frustrated—The Members of the Assembly swear fidelity to the King and the Constitution—Joy of the Poles and

resolve to shew him the marks of Respect—The King's resolution scrupulously to observe and maintain the Constitution—His remarks respecting it—The Queen's sentiments congenial with those of the King—The King refuses his sanction to two Decrees, for declaring all Emigrants Traitors, and for robbing the Non-juring Priests of their Salaries—Seditious addresses presented to the Assembly, by which they are encouraged—Massacres at St. Domingo—The Massacres of the Whites defended by *the friends of the Blacks*—Massacres at Avignon defended by Brazire and by a Cabinet minister—Warlike disposition of the Assembly—Their hostile language and aggressive conduct—Violent speech of Isnard—Address to the King—Anacharsis Cloots recommends a general revolution of the neighbouring States (including England) to the Assembly—Memorable Answer of the President—Brissot insists on the policy of War—Insulting Manifesto issued—Addresses of some seditious Dutchmen, and of certain obscure Englishmen favourably received by the Assembly—Similar address from Liege and the Austrian Netherlands—The Assembly encourages Rebellions in those States—Prudent and pacific conduct of the German Princes—Brissot again insists on the necessity of War—Death of the Emperor Leopold—The assembly compel the King to propose a Declaration of War against Austria, which they vote by *acclamation*—Object of the Brissotin Faction in promoting War—Difference between them and the immediate followers of Robespierre—They concur in their object, but differ as to the means of obtaining it—Annexation of Avignon and the Comtat to France—Commencement of Hostilities in Flanders—Cowardly flight of the French Troops from Tournay—They murder their General, Theobald Dillon—Acts of atrocious barbarity—Flight of the French troops in the neighbourhood of Mons—Change of Ministers—Manifestoes of Austria and Prussia—Brissot

Letter to Elliot on the King—The Ministers refuse to [illegible]—St. Bertrand resigns—Narbonne is dismissed—A New Ministry formed—Progress of Anarchy—Proceedings of the Jacobins Clubs—Horrible acts of Barbarity—Influence of the Press in the destruction of the Monarchy—Treasonable Speech of Isnard in the Assembly—Petition on the Decree for suppressing the King's Guard—Impeachment of the Duke de Brissac—Treacherous conduct of the Ministers—Decree for forming a Camp of 20,000 Insurgents—and for banishing the Non-juring Priests—The King refuses to sanction them—Inconsistent conduct of Dumouriez on this occasion—Addresses threatening the life of the King—Well received by the Assembly—Insurrection of the 20th of June—The King's opinion of that event—Expects to be murdered—Refuses to quit the Capital—Attempt to assassinate the Queen—The Queen rescued—Atrocious conduct of the Federates—Fresh Plots—Addresses from the Sections demanding the Deposition of the King—Conspiracy of the 10th of August—The King and Queen made Prisoners—Committed to the Temple—Judicial murders—Atrocious murder of Helen Maria Williams—Infamous massacre of the Priests, for the first days of September—A wretch rides in triumph with two old men's heads in a sack—Infamous Conduct—Sketch of Military affairs—The allied Armies enter France—Their dilatory movements—Cautious policy of the King of Prussia—Suspension of Hostilities—Private character of the Prussian Monarch—Of the French Emigrants—Different accounts of the respective numbers of the hostile Armies—False assertions of Lieutenant Arthur Dillon—Retreat of the Allies from the frontiers of France.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Reflections on the effects which recent occurrences in France ought to have produced on the early admirers of the French Revolution in England—Effects which they *really* produced—Addresses from English clubs to the French convention—Factious Address from a Society at Newington—Address from the Revolution Society, signed by Dr. Towers, congratulating the French on the deposition of their Monarch, and on the successful exercise of "*The Right of Insurrection*"---United address from societies at Manchester, Norwich, and London, imprecating the destruction of Monarchy through the world---Address of the Constitutional Society, anticipating a national convention in England, accompanied by a present of shoes to the military rebels of France---The President's answer to the address, announcing the near approach of a republic in England---Great confidence of the disaffected in the autumn of 1792—Critical state of the country—Mr. Reeves—His arrival in England---Origin of the Loyal Associations---Their rapid extension, and salutary effects---Their end and object explained---Wholly unconnected with government---Mr. Pitt doubts their policy, and intimates a wish for their suppression---The founders of the associations refuse to comply with his wish---Mr. Pitt changes his opinion, and expresses his approbation of the first committee appointed ---Expenses of the associations, wholly defrayed by the voluntary contributions of the Members—List of the Committee—Mr. Thomas Law—He is expelled from the Committee---Motives of that expulsion---Striking change in the internal appearance of the country---General burst of loyalty---Mr. Pitt appointed warden of the Cinque Ports---Parliament meet---The King's speech---

Debates on the address--Loyal Association abused by the Opposition, who condemn a doctrine which they do not understand--Their censure of a printed paper, by the Reverend William Jones, of Nayland--That paper defended--Mr. Fox again vows his admiration of the French revolution--Motion for the amendment lost by a majority of two hundred and forty--New motion, by Mr. Fox, for opening a negotiation with the French republic--His praise of the French troops, and his abuse of the allied powers--Seconded by Mr. Sheridan--Opposed by Mr. Burke--Motion negatived without a division--Unanimity of Parliament in condemning the trial and approaching murder of the French King--Alien bill introduced by Mr. Pitt--Reflections upon it--Opposed by Mr. Fox--Mr. Fox's inconsistency exposed by Mr. Burke--Atheism, the first fruits of French liberty--Daggers manufactured at Birmingham--One of these produced by Mr. Burke in the House of Commons--Kersaint's testimony to the neutrality of the English--Murder of Louis XVI.--Dismissal of Chauvelin--Royal message--Debate upon it--Mr. Pitt's speech--His horror at the recent murder of the virtuous Louis--Advantages to be derived from that event, considered as a lesson, illustrative of French principles--Eulogy on the British constitution--Memorable decrees of the French Convention, for encouraging insurrection in foreign States--Strict neutrality of England, and the aggressive conduct of France demonstrated--Address of thanks to his Majesty, moved by Mr. Pitt--Observations on Mr. Pitt's conduct at this time--Speech of Mr. Fox--He asserts *the Sovereignty of the People, as paramount to all laws, and their right to punish Kings for misconduct*--The tendency of such declarations--Constant and earnest endeavours of Mr. Pitt to prevent a war, proved by the French agents themselves--Conferences proposed by

Dumouriez, with Lord Auckland and M. Von Spieghel—Communications on that subject—Lord Auckland receives instructions to hold the conference—Place appointed for the purpose—The French Convention send orders to Dumouriez not to hold it.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Royal Message communicating to Parliament the French declaration of war—Debates thereon—Mr. Pitt's Speech—His proofs of British neutrality and of French aggression—Established by authentic documents—Animadversions on the French Manifesto—Its falsehood demonstrated—Its various charges examined and confuted—The French Government guilty of the very acts with the commission of which they reproached the English Government—Mr. Pitt's arguments supported and confirmed by the authority of French writers—Efforts of the French Government to produce an artificial scarcity in England, and to create Rebellion in this Country—Gold and silver purchased with assignats in England, and exported to France—Mr. Pitt moves an address to the King, promising support—Mr. Fox objects to some parts of it—Insists that no specific demand of reparation had been urged by Ministers—Accuses Ministers of an eagerness for war—Moves an Amendment—Mr. Fox's charges against Ministers shewn to be groundless—Chauvelin's dismissal justified from his boasted intimacy with the leaders of the British opposition—Resolution of the French Regicides to exterminate all Monarchs, and to annihilate Monarchy—Mr. Dundas answers Mr. Fox, and proves that specific means for preventing a war had been suggested by the British Cabinet—Mr. Burke ridicules the notions of Mr. Fox—Amendment rejected, and Address carried, without a division—Debate on the same subject in the House of Lords—Lord Lauderdale's boasted friendship for Brissot

rely characterized by Lord Loughborough—The Opposition seem to derive confidence from the diminution of their numbers—They resolve to harass the government by repeated motions for Peace—Mr. Fox moves a string of resolutions—His Speech in support of them—Censures Ministers and justifies France—Memorial presented by Lord Auckland to the States General of Holland—Reprobated by Mr. Fox—Misrepresentations of Mr. Fox corrected—Object and tendency of his resolutions, inferred from his past conduct, and from his known intimacy with M. Chauvelin—Mr. Burke affirms that all the sentiments in Mr. Fox's Speech had already appeared in the French papers, as sentiments that would be offered to the House of Commons—His comments on Mr. Fox's constant defence of the French government—Marks the base ingratitude of Chauvelin—Mr. Fox's resolutions, rejected by a majority of two hundred and seventy-four—Mr. Grey moves resolutions similar to those of Mr. Fox—They are rejected without a division, and without a debate—Discussion on the proposal for the erection of Barracks—The system censured by Mr. Taylor and Mr. Fox—Defended by Mr. Pitt—Proposal of attempts to reduce the Army voted this year—Mr. Hardy's statement of Indian affairs—Prosperity of that Country—Mr. Sheridan's motion for an inquiry into the existence of seditious practices—Opposed by Mr. Windham—Mr. Fox avows his disbelief of plots and conspiracies—Is answered by Mr. Burke—Motion accordingly withdrawn—Mr. Pitt opens the Budget—Ways and Means—The House concurs in his proposed resolutions—Bill for preventing traitorous correspondence brought in by the Attorney General—Objects of the Bill—Attacked by Mr. Fox—Supported by Mr. Martin, Mr. Anderson Norris, and Mr. Burke—Bill carried by a great majority—Discussed in the House of Lords—Opposed by the Duke of Norfolk, the Marquis of Lansdowne and the Earls of Guildford, Lauderdale and Stanhope—Passes into a Law

CHAPTER XXVII.

Means adopted for supporting the Allies of Great Britain---Negotiations for new alliances on the Continent---Designs of the French upon Holland---Dumouriez the supposed author of the plan for the invasion of the United Provinces---Precautions suggested by Lord Auckland, and taken by the Dutch Government, for defeating his plan---Dumouriez's proclamation to the People of Holland---Contradictory to his own avowed principles---Reprinted, with comments, by the States-General---The French enter Holland---Breda surrenders, through the treachery of the Governor---Gertruydenberg follows the example---Brave, but ineffectual, resistance of the garrison of Klundert---Gallant conduct of Boetzelaar, the Governor of Williamstadt---Fruitless attempts of the French to reduce that Fortress---Memorial, presented by Lord Auckland and the Imperial Minister, to the States-General---Observations upon it---It is attacked by Mr. Sheridan, in the House of Commons---Animadversions upon his speech---The memorial is defended by Mr. Pitt---Stigmatized by Mr. Fox---His misrepresentations of the views of the Combined Powers exposed and corrected---Mr. Sheridan's motion for an Address to the King negatived by two hundred and eleven votes against thirty-six---Similar address moved in the Upper House by Lord Lauderdale---Opposed by Lord Grenville---Rejected by the House---The House adopt, by a vote of approbation, the sentiments expressed in the Memorial---Inquiry into the source of the interest taken by the Opposition in the fate of the Commissioners detained as hostages, by Dumouriez---Character and conduct of the Commissioners---All of them shewn to be Traitors and Regicides---Reflections on the crime of mur-

der, and the expediency of an universal compact of nations, for the punishment of murderers, suggested---Temporary distress in the commercial world---Effective measures adopted by Mr. Pitt for their relief---Mr. Grey's plan of Parliamentary Reform---Supported by Mr. Whitbread---His notions upon certain great events in English History examined---Mr. Pitt opposes the motion---Shews the radical difference between the plan of Reform which he had formerly suggested himself and that now proposed by Mr. Grey---Takes a view of the effects produced by the conduct of the French Reformers---Shews, from a similarity of sentiment and language, that all the petitions, presented to the House, had been the work of the same hands---Contends that the House cannot entertain petitions for a pretended right of Universal Suffrage---Ridicules the idea of abstract rights in a Social State---Accuses the present plan of being founded on French principles, and traces its consequences to the introduction of French Anarchy---Proves all the modern theories of Reform to be calculated only to deceive and delude the people---Mr. Fox and Mr. Sheridan support Mr. Grey's plan, and tax Mr. Pitt with inconsistency---Motion rejected by 282 against 11---New motion by Mr. Fox for promoting a Peace with France---Opposed by Mr. Windham and Mr. Burke---Mr. Pitt's speech on the subject---Asserts the impolicy of any advance to the French Government, and the impracticability of making peace at the present juncture---Motion negatived by 187 against 49---Parliament prorogued.

CHAPTER XXVII.

State of France---State of that Country after the murder of the King---Character of Louis XVI. by M. de Malesherbes---Jealousies among the Jacobins---Brissot heads the Girondists, and Robespierre rules the command of the Mountain---Advantage of the latter over the former---

Extraordinary means adopted for reinforcing the Armies---Siege of Maestricht raised---French driven out of Liege---Discontent in the Austrian Netherlands---Dumouriez resumes the command of the French Army---Endeavours to restore Discipline and to check Extortion---Attacks the Austrians at Nerwinde---Is defeated with great loss---Again defeated at Louvain---Retreats towards the French frontier---Comparative force of the two armies---Dumouriez opens a negotiation with the Austrians---His interview with Colonel Mack---His scheme for dissolving the Convention, and for restoring the Constitutional Monarchy---Mack insists on the evacuation of the Austrian Netherlands by the French---Dumouriez accedes to the proposal and withdraws his Army---Commissioners from the Convention order Dumouriez to repair to Paris---He refuses, seizes the Commissioners, and delivers them up to the Austrians---Publishes a Proclamation inviting all loyal Frenchmen to join him---Is fired at by a body of National Guards---Flies to the Austrian Quarters---The Prince de Cobourg, at his request, addresses a Proclamation to the French---Dumouriez returns to his Camp---Defection of his Troops---He quits the Camp and joins the Austrians---Is joined by 1500 of his men---The Austrian Commander recalls his Proclamation, and declares the Armistice at an end---His conduct justified---Causes of the inactivity of the Austrians at this period---Dampierre takes the command of the French Army and attacks the Allies---He is defeated and killed---Is succeeded by Custine---An English Army joins the Austrians---The Allies drive the French from the fortified Camp of Famars---Lay siege to Valenciennes---Vigorous measures of the Convention for arming and training the whole population of France---The Allies force the strong position of Cæsar's Camp---Division of the allied army---Duke of York forms the siege of Dunkirk---The covering army defeated---Siege

raised---Quesnoi taken by the Austrians---The Austrians forced to raise the siege of Maubeuge---State of things at the close of the Campaign in Flanders---Operations on the Rhine---Mentz reduced by the Prussians---The lines of Weissemberg forced by the Prussians---Surrender of Toulon to Lord Hood---Military operations---Superiority of the French---Evacuation of Toulon---Massacre of the Royalists---Account of Ships captured and destroyed---Name of Toulon changed to *Port-Marat*---Reduction of the French Settlements in the East Indies by the British---Capture of Tobago---Internal affairs of France---Struggles between the Jacobins and Girondists---Brissot's Address to his Constituents---A true picture of France---Arts of the Girondists turned against themselves---Camille Desmoulin's answer to Brissot---His Birth, Character, and Conduct---His concern with the Massacres of September---Steps taken for the destruction of the Girondists---They are put under arrest---The system of terror established---Fate of Custine---Mr. Pitt declared by the Convention to be an enemy of the human race---The right of emancipating him referred to the consideration of a Committee---Erection of a Revolutionary Tribunal---Trial and execution of the Queen of France---Her Daughter consigned to the care and instruction of Simon a cobler---Confession of the Queen's Character by the absence of all proof against her---Trial of Brissot---His unconstitutional interference of the Jacobin Club to influence the proceedings---Decree of the Convention for that purpose---The Girondists condemned and executed---Trial of Camille Desmoulins---His blasphemous address to the Judges---His execution---Execution of Le Bon---Madame Roland---Barnave---and Bailli.

THE

POLITICAL

LIFE OF MR. PITT.

CHAPTER XVI.

Effects of Mr. Fox's declared approbation of the French Revolution—Approaching Schism in the Opposition—Fruitless endeavours to avert it—Declaration of abstract Principles contended to be no ground of dissension—Mr. Burke entertains a different opinion—His apprehensions of danger from French Principles shewn to be well-founded—Character of his "*Reflections on the Revolution in France*."—Resolves to defend that book against the attacks of Mr. Fox in the House of Commons—Communicates his resolution to Ministers, and to Mr. Fox himself—Mr. Sheridan moves the re-commitment of the Canada-Bill after the Easter Recess—Some Members of the Opposition deprecate all reflections foreign from the immediate subject of discussion—Unparliamentary conduct of Mr. Taylor in anticipating a disorderly debate—Mr. Fox denies any statement of Republican Principles as applied to *this* Country—Adheres to his former declarations on the subject of France—Mr. Burke asserts the necessity of referring to other Constitutions in discussing the merits of a new Constitution—Avows his intention of discussing certain Principles of Government in the future Debates on the Bill,—and declares his readiness to sacrifice

his friendship for Mr. Fox to the Love of his Country—Royal Message on the Russian Armament—State of the contest between Russia and the Porte—Negotiations for a Peace opened between those powers — The Empress Catherine rejects the proffered mediation of Great Britain and Prussia—Her hostile spirit towards Great Britain—Her ambitious views on Poland, and on Turkey—Mr. Pitt resolves to counteract those views—Mr. Fawkener is sent as Envoy Extraordinary to attend the Negotiations for Peace—Mr. Pitt moves the Address to the Throne on the message—Explains the motives and the policy of the proposed Measure—The Motion opposed by Mr. Fox, who takes a very contracted and unfair view of the Question—He is answered by Mr. Pitt—Motion carried—The Subject revived by Mr. Grey, who calls upon the House to adopt resolutions disapproving the very Address which they had recently voted—Contends that the conquest of Turkey, by Russia, would be beneficial to mankind—Displays the spirit of the ancient Crusaders—Mr. Pitt observes a profound silence on the Question—Their supporters insist on the pernicious and ruinous Effects of the Russian System of Policy—Mr. Sheridan again panegyrises the French Revolution, and bespeaks perpetual Peace with regenerated France—Mr. Grey's Resolutions rejected by a majority of eighty—Fresh discussion on the same Topic introduced by Mr. Baker—Mr. Pitt claims, for Ministers, the confidence of the Country *pending a negotiation*—Mr. Fox pronounces another Eulogy on the new Constitution of France—Motion of Mr. Baker rejected by a majority of ninety-two—A *fourth* debate on the Subject, on the motion of Mr. Thomas Grenville, which is rejected by a majority of ninety-four—Disadvantages under which the Minister laboured, during these discussions, from his inability to

communicate all the motives of his Conduct—Reflections on the Confidence to be reposed in Ministers—Mr. Fox sends Mr. Adair to St. Petersburgh, as *his* Representative, to thwart the designs of his Majesty's Ministers, and to frustrate the Endeavours of his Majesty's Envoy—Mr. Burke's account of that Transaction, aptly characterized as a HIGH TREASONABLE MISDEMEANOUR—Favourable reception of Mr. Adair at the Russian Court—Effects of this unconstitutional Embassy—The Empress makes Peace with the Porte on her own Terms—Renewed discussions on the Canada-Bill—Mr. Burke's Speech—His Analysis of the new "Rights of Man."—Contrasts the French Constitution with the British—Depicts the misery of the French Colonies from the importation of the New Principles—Is called to order—Is supported by Mr. Pitt—Lord Sheffield moves that dissertations on the French Constitution are disorderly—Mr. Fox seconds the Motion—Mr. Pitt declares Mr. Burke to have spoken strictly in order—Mr. Fox attacks Mr. Burke; taxes him with Inconsistency, and reminds him that they had both deplored the death of American Rebels—Remarks on this and other parts of Mr. Fox's Speech—He is answered by Mr. Burke, who disclaims the motives imputed to him,—exposes the fallacy of Mr. Fox's Arguments, and the duplicity of his Conduct—Describes the future Effects of the French Revolution—His Patriotism praised—His impressive exhortations to the two great Political Rivals—Mr. Fox replies—Mr. Burke rejoins—Adverts to the Proceedings of the seditious Societies in England—Mr. Pitt closes the discussion, by recommending Lord Sheffield's Motion to be withdrawn, and expresses his gratitude to Mr. Burke for his eloquent defence of the Constitution—Farther discussion of the Canada-Bill—Mr. Fox *modifies* some of his former opinions respecting an *Aristocracy*—

Remarks of Mr. Pitt—Answer of Mr. Burke—Reflections on their respective Sentiments — Radical difference of Principle, independent of the French Revolution, between Mr. Burke and Mr. Fox—Generous Conduct of Mr. Pitt—Prorogation of Parliament.

[1791.] The debates on the Canada-Bill having produced an explicit declaration of opinion on the subject of the French Revolution, and not merely of opinion confined to that one object, but of *principles* applicable to all systems of government, and, consequently, to the British constitution itself, from the leaders of opposition in the House of Commons, the party exhibited strong apprehensions of a schism, and considerable efforts were made to prevent it. The friends of Mr. Fox accused him of imprudence in entering upon a subject which the question, under discussion, did not of necessity require; but this was an imprudence of which Mr. Fox was often guilty, for he was woefully deficient in judgment, and constantly *committed himself*, by advancing general principles when only called upon to give his opinion upon particular topics.—They made advances to those who were known to be more particularly attached to Mr. Burke, and who, indeed, were not less anxious than

themselves, to avert a division which would, in fact, dissolve the party. They all were disposed to think, even those who thought with Mr. Fox, as those who differed from him, on the French Revolution, that a declaration of abstract principles was not a sufficient ground for separation, and that it would be time enough to separate when any national question should occur, to call for a practical application of those principles.

Mr. Burke, however, thought differently, and thought more justly. No one was more strongly attached than himself to his friends, both personal and political; but his sense of public duty now rose superior to all feelings of attachment, and reigned paramount over every private consideration. He had viewed the recent transactions in France, not only through a statesman's glass, but with a prophetic eye. — His comprehensive mind had, as it were, with intuitive wisdom, grasped all their bearings and tendencies; he perceived that the principles and the actions of the Gallic reformers were neither meant to be, nor in their nature could be, limited to the country which gave them birth; but that they were calculated for all nations, and for all ages, to eradicate every thing that was settled, every thing that was good, every thing that was

worthy of preservation, and to substitute in their place every thing that was infamous, impure, and unholy. He was aware that the pretexts for promulgating those principles, and for committing those actions, were of a description to apply equally to every country, and to every constitution; that no form of government could resist, that no results of experience could withstand, them. The approbation which they had already received from different societies in England, now daily increasing in numbers, and in violence, had filled him with well-founded alarm, that his native country would not escape their pestilential touch, and that the mania of rebellion would infect her inhabitants. Every object around him, at this period, served to strengthen his apprehensions, and to confirm his suspicions. Clubs were rising in every part, and congratulatory addresses were sent to the National Assembly, who were complimented, not merely for what they had done in their own country, but for *the wonderful revolution which they had prepared for the rest of the world.** Mr. Burke's sen-

* See the answer of the Revolution Society to the friends of the constitution, and of equality, in the City of Montpellier; dated London, March 27, 1791; in the *Correspondence of the Revolution Society, &c.* 8vo. p. 44.

timents on these subjects had been delivered to the public in a work sufficient of itself to immortalize his memory; exhibiting the finest effusions of a rich and lively imagination, but distinguished still more for soundness of judgment, and solidity of wisdom. It was impossible for him, therefore, not to believe that the admiration which Mr. Fox had so recently, and repeatedly, expressed of the French Revolution, was intended, as indeed it was calculated, to counteract the salutary effects of his own publications, and to hold up its author as the advocate for despotism, while Mr. Fox proclaimed himself to be the Champion of Liberty. It must not be forgotten too, that, at this time, Paine's Rights of Man, and other tracts of a similar nature and tendency, had appeared, and were most industriously circulated through the kingdom. Under these circumstances, Mr. Burke's feelings and apprehensions were perfectly natural, both in respect of Mr. Fox, and with regard to the country. He considered that Mr. Fox's name and authority would be a tower of strength to the factious, and would give them an adventitious weight, that would be of essential service to their cause. All attempts, therefore, to compromise the difference between them, or to continue to act as public friends, after

the grand basis of political friendship—*idem sentire de republicâ*—was removed, of necessity proved fruitless: they both stood committed to their country, and it remained to be seen in favour of which the country would decide.

Mr. Burke having thus resolved to defend his own principles against those of Mr. Fox, in the same place in which they had been attacked, determined to avail himself of the opportunity which the re-commitment of the Canada-bill would afford him, for the renewal of the subject. He then apprized some of the ministers of his intention, claiming their assistance in the House, to secure him against those clamorous interruptions which he had before experienced;—and he afterwards communicated his plan to Mr. Fox himself. When the question came before the House, Mr. Sheridan moved that the bill should be re-committed till after the Easter recess; at the same time, declaring that his own objections went to the fundamental principle of the bill, and, of course, could not be removed by any alterations which it might undergo in the committee.—Some of the members of the opposition, alarmed at the prospect of the approaching schism, deprecated all allusion to subjects foreign to that under discussion; and Mr. Taylor observed, that the business had been improperly treated,

as involving the consideration of general principles of government, and the constitutions of other countries; and he gave notice, that if the minister, or any other right honourable gentleman, should wander from the proper subject of discussion, he should call him to order, and take the sense of the House upon the occasion.

This unparliamentary conduct, (for nothing could be more unparliamentary than to anticipate a disorderly debate) tending to limit the freedom of debate, and to confine enlarged and liberal minds within the narrow sphere of discussion which minds of a different texture prescribe to themselves, or rather which nature prescribes to them, was adopted solely for the unparliamentary purpose of preventing the dissensions of a party. Mr. Burke, however, though so pointedly alluded to, suffered Mr. Fox to rise first, who entered into some explanation of his former speech, and contended that, in forming a government for a colony, some attention must be paid to the general principles of all governments. In the course of that session, he said, he had taken opportunities of alluding, perhaps too often, to the French revolution, and to shew, whether right or wrong, that his opinion, on the whole, was much in its favour; but on this bill he had introduced only one levity, silly enough, per-

haps, and not worth recollection, which had any relation to the French revolution; he meant an allusion to the extinction of nobility in France, and its revival in Canada. Certainly he had spoken much on the government of the American States, because they were in the vicinity of Canada, and were connected with that province.—The prudence of concealing his opinions, was a quality which his dearest friends had not very often imputed to him; — he thought the public had a right to the opinions of public men on public measures; and he declared, that he never stated any republican principles, *with regard to this country*, in or out of Parliament.—He added, that, in the future discussion of the Canada-bill, though he should be extremely sorry to differ from some of his friends, for whom he entertained a great respect, he should not be backward in delivering his opinion, and he had no wish to recede from any thing which he had formerly advanced.

This irregular conversation was closed by Mr. Burke, who, with great feeling, assured the House, that nothing had ever given him greater affliction than the thought of meeting his friend as an adversary and antagonist.—After noticing the anticipation which had been suggested, and the observations which had been made, but for which he trusted he had given

no just cause, he declared his sentiments, that, in framing a new constitution, it was necessary to refer to principles of government, and examples of other constitutions, because it was a material part of every political question, to examine how far such and such principles have been adopted, and how they have succeeded in other places.—This, indeed, is so obvious a truth, that it affords matter of astonishment that any one could be found to dispute it. Mr. Burke proceeded to state, that his opinions on government were not unknown, and the more he considered the French constitution, the more sorry he was to see it. In the preceding session he had thought himself under the necessity of speaking very fully upon the subject; but since that time he had never mentioned it, either directly or indirectly; no man, therefore, could charge him with having provoked the conversation which had passed.—He declared, however, his intention of giving his judgment on certain principles of government in the future progress of the Canada-bill.—He touched on the difference between Mr. Fox and himself, and desired it to be recollected, that, however dear he considered the friendship of that gentleman, there was something still dearer in his mind—*the love of his country*;—nor was he stimulated by ministers to take the part which

he should take; for, whatever they knew of his political principles, they had learned from him, not he from them.

Having brought down the debates on the Canada-bill, much more important in themselves, and in the consequences which they produced, than the subject which gave rise to them, to the Easter recess, it becomes necessary to revert to another topic of discussion, recommended to the attention of Parliament in a message from the King.—In this message, which was delivered on the 28th of March, his Majesty informed the House, that the endeavours which he had used, in conjunction with his allies, to effect a pacification between Russia and the Porte, having hitherto been unsuccessful, and the consequences which might arise from the further progress of the war being highly important to the interests of his Majesty and his allies, and to those of Europe in general, his Majesty judged it requisite, in order to add weight to his representations, to make some further augmentation of his naval force; and he expressed his reliance on the zeal and affection of Parliament to make good such additional expense as might be incurred by such preparations, for the purpose of supporting the interests of his kingdom, and of contributing to

the restoration of general tranquillity on a secure and lasting foundation.

The grand object of this interference, between the belligerent powers, was to preserve that balance which the wisest statesmen had thought necessary for the protection and security of the weaker states against the ambition and violence of the stronger; and to prevent the aggrandizement of a potentate who had displayed, on all occasions, the most marked spirit of hostility against this country.—That this was a wise and salutary policy cannot be denied; it was by a similar principle that the conduct of the whigs, under King William, and of every wise administration, from that reign to the present, was regulated;—and the only fair subject for consideration, in the present instance, was, whether the balance of power would be so deranged by the aggrandizement of Russia, and the humiliation of the Porte, as to justify the active interference of Great Britain. The war between these two states had been carried on with a degree of inveteracy of which the history of modern times supplies but few examples; and Europe and Asia had been deluged with the blood of their respective troops.—The good fortune, and the superior discipline and prowess, of the Russians at length prevailed, and the period had

now arrived, when the Turks, harassed, defeated, and exhausted, reluctantly acceded to proposals for negotiating a treaty of peace, which had, indeed, become equally necessary to their victorious enemy,—as well to afford her time for recruiting her armies, and for replenishing her treasures, as for maturing those plans which she had already formed for extending her dominions by the partition of Poland.

Mr. Pitt, apprized of the ambitious projects of the Russian Empress, and sensible of their tendency to destroy the balance of power, and to give her, in the scale of Europe, a preponderance which would be highly detrimental to the interests of Great Britain, had, in concert with the court of Berlin, offered the mediation of this country, with a view to prevent, as far as possible, the imperial Catherine from extorting, from the humbled Ottomans, such terms as would greatly facilitate the accomplishment of her secret schemes. This mediation had, indeed, been offered at an early period of the war, when it was rejected, with pride and disdain, by the Empress, whose lofty spirit could ill brook control.—Nay, such was the indignation which she felt at any attempt to interfere with her plans of ambition, that she suffered no opportunity to escape for manifesting her resentment.—She had refused to

renew the treaty of commerce with this country, which had recently expired; while, to render her conduct more pointed, she signed a commercial treaty with our natural rival, France, upon terms highly favourable to that nation. In these instances, however, she did no more than every independent power has a right to do; and, whatever umbrage her conduct might give to the Court of St. James's, it certainly afforded no reasonable ground of hostility. But the plans which she was known to have formed for her further aggrandizement, and (to say nothing of their flagrant injustice) their manifest tendency to augment her own power by the ruin of independent States, were to be considered in a very different point of view, and fully justified the active and determined interposition of those States which had combined for the laudable purpose of supporting the balance of power in the North of Europe. Catherine had openly avowed her resolution to interfere in the internal concerns of Poland, in order to prevent those projected improvements in the state of that divided country which would prove hostile to her own unprincipled plans.—That avowal alone was sufficient to alarm all the neighbouring States, and more than sufficient to justify any combination which had for its object the defeat of such schemes.

But the ambition of Catherine, disdaining alike the suggestions of honour, and the dictates of justice, was not to be restrained within ordinary bounds: Poland alone was a sphere too contracted for the operations of her capacious and aspiring mind;—her views were extended to Turkey; and she had made no secret of her intentions to place the imperial Crown on the head of her grandson, Constantine, in the metropolis of the Ottoman Empire.—It was impossible that, to such views as these, a British minister could be indifferent;—Mr. Pitt, who was early apprized of them, had framed the whole system of his foreign policy for the purpose of counteracting them. His proffered mediation had been twice rejected; but Mr. Fawkener was, nevertheless, sent as envoy extraordinary to attend the negotiations for peace, between the contracting powers, and to afford all possible assistance to the Turks.—The great impediment to the conclusion of the treaty was the perseverance of Russia in insisting on retaining possession of the important fortress of Oczakow with its dependencies, which she had taken from the Turks in 1788. By this means she would secure an easy entrance into the Turkish Provinces, and materially facilitate her march to Constantinople,

whenever a fit opportunity should occur for the accomplishment of her favourite scheme.

Such was the ground of that conduct which the King announced to the House of Commons in his message. On the 29th of March, the day after the message was delivered, Mr. Pitt moved an address to his Majesty, thanking him for his communication, and promising him support.—He supported his motion on the ground of general policy, and on the particular interest which, he contended, we had in the dispute between the belligerent powers. That interest he described as direct and important; and, as all our efforts for the restoration of tranquillity, had proved unavailing, we were induced to the necessity of arming, in order to give greater weight to our representations. Having entered into defensive alliances, which were admitted to be wise and politic, it was our duty to adhere to them, and to prevent, as far as possible, any changes in the general state of affairs, which might render them nugatory. Any event which might affect the power of Prussia, who was our ally, and diminish her influence on the continent, would be injurious to ourselves, as far as our mutual interests were united. The successful progress of the Russian arms afforded sufficient grounds of alarm; for, should Russia pursue her career of vic-

tory, and the power of the Porte be farther humbled by its aspiring rival, Prussia would instantly feel the effect, and not Prussia alone, but all Europe itself, might prove in danger of being shaken to its very foundation.

Mr. Fox expressed his conviction that no danger could arise to Prussia, from any progress which the Russians might make in the dominions of the Porte;—and he reduced the point at issue to a very narrow compass, by putting the whole of our system of foreign policy, and the balance of power, entirely out of the question; and by stating the dispute between Great Britain and Russia, to be nothing more than whether the latter should restore the whole of her foreign conquests, or only a part of them. Having thus stripped the conduct of ministers of every thing in which it had originated, by which it was directed, and by which it either was attempted to be, or possibly could be, justified, he proceeded to infer, that the only ground of quarrel was her unwillingness to resign a tract of country, between the Niester and the Don, a barren and unprofitable tract, but particularly desirable to the Empress, as it contained the fortress of Oczakow, which, in her estimation, was a place of much value.—He condemned ministers for not having formed an alliance with Russia, which appeared to him to be the

most natural, and the most advantageous, which we could possibly form.

These reasons were combated by Mr. Pitt, who again insisted that the aggrandizement of Russia, and the depression of Turkey, would materially affect both our political and commercial interests. But as he necessarily spoke under considerable restraint, as he was unable, during the existence of a negotiation, to disclose any thing more than the general principles by which the conduct of ministers was directed, and his adversaries, availing themselves of this circumstance, had no difficulty, and made no scruple, to give a popular turn to their own arguments, he carried the question for the address by a majority of only ninety-three. And the opposition, encouraged by the unusual greatness of the number which divided with them, resolved again to bring the subject before the House.—Mr. Grey, accordingly, on the 12th of April, moved a set of resolutions, the object of which was to express disapprobation of the very measures which the House had, by its address, directly approved. Mr. Grey, in supporting these resolutions, advanced certain abstract principles, from which he drew practical inferences, applicable, or rather applied by him, to the immediate subject of discussion.—Self-defence, he insisted, was the only justifi-

able ground of war, and neither we, nor our allies, were in danger of attack from Russia; therefore, war with Russia was unjust: and he contended, that it behoved ministers to shew how the balance of power could be endangered by the possession of Oczakow, by the Russians, before the nation should be called upon to support the war. — This art of *simplification* seems to have been principally relied on by the opposition, and, strange to say, it produced a much greater effect than any experienced politician, or rational individual, could possibly have expected. Mr. Grey, however, and his supporters, neither proved their experience as politicians, nor their reason as men, in maintaining that, were the Empress of Russia to realize all her imputed views of ambition, were she to obtain possession of Constantinople itself, and to expel the Turks from all their European Provinces, mankind, so far from being injured, would be considerably benefited by it. The spirit of the ancient crusaders seems indeed to have been revived, at this period, by the opposition, who appeared as anxious to expel the infidels from Europe, as their ancestors, in former ages, had been to drive the Turks from Palestine, and to erect the cross on the ruins of the crescent. The confidence which ministers claimed was reprobated

in language more strong than just, and with a degree of warmth, in which the decorum of legislators, and personal respect, were alike disregarded.

Mr. Pitt, and all the Members of the Cabinet, observed a profound silence, rather choosing to subject themselves to the effects of misrepresentation, than to betray the duty which they owed to their Sovereign, and to the country. It was, however, observed, by those who were satisfied with their conduct, that the possession of Oczakow, by Catherine, would facilitate not only the acquisition of Constantinople, but of all Lower Egypt and Alexandria, which would secure to Russia the command of the Mediterranean, and render her a formidable rival, both as a maritime and commercial power. It was truly remarked, that the question was not of what intrinsic importance the Turkish empire might be, in itself, individually considered; but rather how the acquisition of a considerable and important part of it, by Russia, would affect the general safety of Europe, and the particular interests of Great Britain. But the Empress was not only charged with designs upon the Porte; her ambitious views were known to extend to the destruction of all the powers of the North.

Mr. Grey's motion was lost by a majority of only eighty.

During this debate, Mr. Sheridan spoke with considerable warmth and animation, on the side of opposition, and concluded his speech with a renewal of his former panegyrics on the French revolution, and with an expression of his *immutable* adherence to the opinions which he had lately promulgated on that event: and he declared his earnest wish that peace might be inviolably preserved with the new government of France. As not the smallest disposition had been evinced by the British ministry to interrupt the tranquillity which subsisted between the two countries, it might have been inferred, from the unnecessary expression of this wish, that Mr. Sheridan was aware, that the conduct of regenerated France would be such as to provoke a war with Great Britain.

This progressive diminution of the majority raised the spirits of the opposition, and encouraged them to persevere in their efforts, without the smallest regard to the consequences which they might have, either on their own country, or on the general state of the northern powers. Mr. Baker, on the 15th of April, moved, that it was at all times the right and duty of the House, before they consented to lay any burdens on their constituents, to

inquire into the justice and necessity of the object, in the prosecution of which such burdens were to be incurred; and, that no information had been given to the House which could satisfy them, that the expenses to be incurred by the present armament were necessary to support the interest of the nation, or would contribute to the great and important object of restoring the tranquillity of Europe on a secure and lasting foundation. No new arguments were employed on this occasion,—but Mr. Pitt thought it necessary to make some few observations on the subject.—He said that, notwithstanding the many calls which had been made upon him, and the many harsh epithets which had been applied to his silence, his sense of duty to his Sovereign and his Country should still remain the rule of his conduct; he meant, therefore, to enter into no detail of the pending negotiation;—to offer no explanation inconsistent with his official duties. He contended that sufficient information had been given for the simple act of voting the armament, his Majesty having expressly stated, in his message, that such a measure was necessary to give effect to the negotiations, in which he was engaged, for laying the foundation of a solid and durable peace. He admitted, however, that the House was not pledged to support a war with

out further explanation; the House might repose confidence in the servants of the Crown pending a negotiation, but that was substantively different from a pledge to support a war, should the negotiations prove unsuccessful.—That which was a sufficient cause for an armament might not be a sufficient cause for a war.

Mr. Fox, however, refused to admit the justice of this distinction, and contended that the contrary was the fact.—In imitation of Mr. Sheridan, in a preceding debate, he closed his speech with a pompous panegyric of the new constitution of France.—This called up Mr. Burke, but, as the hour was late, the general cry for the question induced that gentleman to forego his right of delivering his sentiments, in opposition to those of Mr. Fox, and the division took place, when the majority for the minister was found to have increased from *eighty* to *ninety-two.* But such a majority was still deemed sufficiently encouraging to induce the opposition to hazard another division on the subject;—and it was brought forward, in a different form, on the 25th of May, by Mr. Thomas Grenville, who chiefly insisted on the right of the House to advise the King in the exercise of his prerogative, and on the necessity of exercising that right in the present instance, in order to prevent the consequences of an

improper interference between Russia and the Porte. Mr. Pitt acceded to the principle, but denied the justice of its application to the point in question. The majority for ministers, on this question, was ninety-four. In the House of Lords the same question was discussed at length, and the same arguments were used on both sides, and with a similar result. It is certain, that Mr. Pitt's administration experienced a more formidable opposition on this point than it had hitherto experienced on any other.—But the ministers laboured under peculiar disadvantages from their inability to explain all the circumstances which first induced them to adopt, and afterwards to persevere in, the line of conduct which they, so consistently, and so resolutely, pursued. Had Mr. Pitt been at liberty to explain all that he knew respecting the designs of Russia on Poland, there can be no doubt but that he would have received the cordial support of a much greater majority of the House: and the result of this discussion proved the necessity of reposing a certain degree of confidence in the servants of the Crown, pending a negotiation with foreign powers. Such confidence could lead, in such a case as that in question, to no dangerous consequences; and if it should have afterwards appeared to have been misplaced or abused, the Parliament would have

had it in their power to inflict a proper punishment upon ministers, whose responsibility would have increased in exact proportion to the confidence reposed in them. On the other hand, from withholding that confidence, the most mischievous consequences might arise; so that, upon a fair calculation of advantages and disadvantages, it is evident that the confidence ought to have been granted, since the former greatly overbalanced the latter.

But the constitutional mode of opposing the ministers, in Parliament, was not the only means adopted by Mr. Fox for defeating the projects of Mr. Pitt.—He had recourse to a measure unprecedented in the annals of party, and wholly unjustifiable on any pretext whatever. He did not hesitate to send Mr. Adair, a gentleman known only as a distant relation of his own, to the court of St. Petersburgh, as *his* representative, and for the express purpose of counteracting the endeavours of his Majesty's accredited minister to induce the Empress to accede to the proposals of the British cabinet. This transaction, which it is difficult to characterize in appropriate terms, cannot be so well described as in the language of Mr. Burke, who could not be suspected of entertaining any undue prejudice against one with whom he had long

lived in habits of the closest intimacy, and of the most endearing friendship.

" The laws and constitution of the kingdom," says that eloquent writer, and sound reasoner, " entrust the sole and exclusive right of treating with foreign potentates to the king.—This is an undisputed part of the legal prerogative of the Crown.—However, notwithstanding this, Mr. Fox, without the knowledge or participation of any one person in the House of Commons, with whom he was bound by every party principle, in matters of delicacy and importance, confidentially to communicate, thought proper to send Mr. Adair, as his representative, and with his cypher, to St. Petersburgh, there to frustrate the objects for which the minister from the crown was authorized to treat.—He succeeded in this his design, and did actually frustrate the King's minister in some of the objects of his negotiation.

" This proceeding of Mr. Fox does not, as I conceive, amount to absolute high treason, Russia, though on bad terms, not having been then declaredly at war with this kingdom; but such a proceeding is, in law, not very remote from that offence, and is, undoubtedly, A MOST UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACT, and AN HIGH TREASONABLE MISDEMEANOR.

" The legitimate and sure mode of com-

munication between this nation and foreign powers is rendered uncertain, precarious, and treacherous, by being divided into two channels; one with the government, one with the head of a party in opposition to that government; by which means the foreign powers can never be assured of the real authority or validity of any public transaction whatsoever.

" On the other hand, the advantage taken of the discontent, which at that time prevailed in Parliament, and in the nation, to give to an individual an influence directly against the government of his country, in a foreign court, has made a highway into England for the intrigues of foreign courts in our affairs. This is a sore evil; an evil from which, before this time, England was more free than any other nation. Nothing can preserve us from that evil which connects cabinet-factions abroad with popular factions here, but the keeping sacred the Crown, as the only channel of communication with every other nation.

" This proceeding of Mr. Fox has given a strong countenance, and an encouraging example, to the doctrines and practices of the revolution and constitutional societies, and of other mischievous societies of that description; who, without any legal authority, and even without any corporate capacity, are in the

habit of proposing, and, to the best of their power, of forming, leagues and alliances with France."

The reception which this representative of Mr. Fox experienced at the Court of St. Petersburgh, was, of itself, sufficient to prove that the nature of his instructions was highly agreeable to the Empress, and, of course, that the instructions were such as any subject of Great Britain should have been equally ashamed to dictate, to deliver, or to bear. Mr. Adair had always the post of honour assigned him, at the right hand of Catharine, whenever the British Ambassador was present. The encouragement which this extraordinary mission afforded the Empress, made her persist in her claims on the Porte, and reject every proposal which the representative of the British Monarch made her, in behalf of that power. The treaty of Peace was concluded at Gralutz, on the 11th of August, by which Russia acquired the important fortress of Oczakow, and all the country between the Bog and the Niester, with the free navigation of the latter river. The presents made to Mr. Adair, on this occasion, were more costly than those which were made to the King's representative. Had a subject of Catharine thus attempted to thwart her views at the Court of St. James's, the mildest fate that

would have awaited him, on his return to Russia, would have been perpetual banishment in the Deserts of Siberia.—But the power which this Imperial Autocrate enjoyed, and the despotism with which she exercised it, removed from her bosom every apprehension of disobedience to her orders, or of opposition to her will. She had no dread, therefore, of the influence of example, in encouraging that conduct in a foreigner, which she would have punished with signal severity in a Russian. The impression produced on the public mind, in England, by the debates in Parliament, prevented the Minister from having recourse to hostile measures for giving effect to the mediation of his Sovereign; and Mr. Fox had the satisfaction of so far succeeding in his plan, though it failed to accomplish his main object,—the removal of Ministers.

After the Easter recess, the discussions on the Canada Bill were renewed, and the greatest expectations were excited in the public mind, from the known intention of Mr. Burke to enter more at large, than he had hitherto done, on those great parts on which Mr. Fox and he had publicly differed. On the 6th of May, the House proceeded to the re-commitment of the bill, when Mr. Burke opened the debate: he remarked that, as they were about to ap-

point a legislature for a distant people, it was their first business to be previously convinced, that they were competent to the assumption of such a power. A body of rights, commonly called the "Rights of Man," had been lately imported from a neighbouring country, and held up, by certain persons in this kingdom, as paramount to all other rights. A principal article in this new code was, "That all men are born free, equal in respect of rights, and continue so in society." If such a doctrine were to be admitted, the power of the House would extend no further than to call together the inhabitants of Canada, and recommend to them the free choice of a government for themselves. But he rather chose to argue from another code, on which mankind, in all ages, had hitherto acted,—from the law of nations.—On this alone Mr. Burke conceived the competence of the House to rest; from this we learnt, that we possessed a right of legislating for Canada, founded on a claim of sovereignty over that country, which was at first obtained by conquest, but afterwards confirmed, and acknowledged, by the cession of its former government, and established by a long uninterrupted possession.

After these preliminary remarks, Mr. Burke proceeded to consider on what model the pro-

posed constitution was to be formed. The inhabitants of Canada were known to be composed of ancient French settlers, and of new American emigrants; it might, therefore, be proper to inquire whether the constitutions of France and America possessed any advantages which the British constitution could not impart; and which, if not given by the present bill, might make those people contemplate, with regret, the happier situation of their former countrymen. Having made several ingenious remarks on the nature and principles of the American constitution, which he considered as best adapted to the genius and manners of the inhabitants of the United States; he observed, that the Americans acted too wisely to set up so absurd an idea as that the nation should govern the nation; but formed a constitution as aristocratical, and monarchical, as their situation would permit; they formed one upon the admirable model of the British constitution, reduced to its primary principles. Yet he was averse from giving this constitution to the Canadians, because they might have one more nearly allied to the model which the Americans themselves had followed.

Mr. Burke then asked, whether the House should give to the French inhabitants of Canada the new constitution of France,—

a constitution founded on principles diametrically opposite to our own; as different from it as Folly from Wisdom, as Vice from Virtue;—a constitution founded on what was called the Rights of Man? The authors of it had told us, and their partizans, the societies here, had told us, that it was a great monument erected for the instruction of mankind. This was certainly not done without a view to imitation.—But, before we proceeded to give it to our colonies, it would be wise to examine what effects its practical application to the colonies of France had produced, (where the new principles of Parisian politics had been introduced, and propagated with ardour,) that they might be enabled to appreciate the blessings which they were about to confer. The mode of reasoning from effects to causes was the old-fashioned way. It had been adopted in experimental philosophy, and might, with equal propriety, be applied to the philosophy of the human mind.—He should therefore use it now. The French West India Islands were in the most flourishing state, until the fatal moment when the Rights of Man were imported.—Scarcely, said Mr. Burke, was this precious doctrine received among them, when Pandora's box, replete with all mortal evils, seemed to fly open, hell itself to yawn, and every demon

of mischief to overspread the face of the earth. Blacks rose against Whites,—Whites against Blacks,—and each against the other in murderous hostility; subordination was destroyed; the cords of society torn asunder; and every man appeared to thirst for the blood of his neighbour. The mother country, not receiving any great degree of pleasure in contemplating this image of herself reflected in her child, sent out a body of troops, well instructed, likewise, in the new principles, to restore order and tranquillity. These troops, immediately upon their arrival, felt themselves bound to become parties in the general rebellion, and, like most of their brethren at home, began the assertion of their free-born rights, by murdering their general. — Should such an example induce us to ship off, for Canada, a cargo of the Rights of Man?

In order to shew that these evils arose from the new principles themselves, and not from any cause peculiar to the West Indies, Mr. Burke described the effects which they had produced in the mother country. The National Assembly of France had boasted, that they would establish a fabric of government, which time could not destroy, and the latest posterity would admire. The boast had been echoed by the Clubs of this country,—the

Unitarians, the Revolution Society, the Constitutional Society, and the Club of the 14th of July. The Assembly had now continued nearly two years in possession of the absolute authority which they usurped; yet they did not appear to have advanced a single step in settling any thing like a government; but to have contented themselves with enjoying the democratic satisfaction of heaping every disgrace on fallen royalty. The constitution must be expected now, if ever, to be nearly completed;—to try whether it was good in its effects, he should have recourse to the last accounts of the assembly itself. They had a King, such as they wished; a King who was no King; over whom the Marquis de la Fayette, chief gaoler of Paris, mounted guard. Mr. Burke was proceeding to describe the circumstance of the Parisian mob having surrounded the royal carriage, on the road to Saint Cloud, with a view to prevent the King from proceeding to that palace, when he was called to order by the members of the opposition, and a singular altercation ensued, which lasted for some time. This interruption was evidently designed to prevent him from continuing his speech;—and, for some time, all the efforts of Mr. Burke to be heard, on the point of order, were fruitless, though supported by Mr. Pitt, and

two or three others of the ministerial side of the House. — The extraordinary scene was, at length, terminated by a motion from Lord Sheffield, " That dissertations on the French constitution are not regular, or orderly, on the question 'That the clauses of the Quebec bill be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.'" —Strange to say, Mr. Fox, who had, in former stages of this very bill, introduced similar dissertations, seconded the motion.

Mr. Pitt, who had before been called upon for his opinion, by Mr. Grey and Mr. Sheridan, drew a distinction between a question of order and a question of discretion.—In point of discretion, he expressed a wish that the French revolution should not be discussed.—But he did justice to Mr. Burke's motives, which he could trace to no other source than a pure regard for the constitution of his country; and he thought him fully in order, as the bill went to give a constitution to a people, at once French, American, and English.

Mr. Fox taxed Mr. Burke with an evident eagerness to seek a difference of opinion, and an anxiety to discover a cause of dispute.—On the subject of the French revolution he knew that their opinions were wide as the Poles asunder.—Still, however, he adhered to his original sentiments, nor would he ever retract

one syllable which he had said upon it.—He thought it, upon the whole, one of the most glorious events in the history of mankind.—But he desired to be understood, as thus speaking of the revolution, and not of the constitution, of France, which remained to be improved by experience, and accommodated to circumstances. The old despotism was annihilated; the new system had the good of the people for its object;* and that was the point on which he rested. With respect to the effect which the example of France might have on Great Britain, when any man could prove that this country was in the precise situation of France, at the time of her revolution, then, and not till then, would he declare, disregarding all the obloquy which might be heaped upon such a declaration, that the French revolution was an object of imitation for Great Britain.—

* If Mr. Fox had said that the good of the people was the *pretext* for the revolution, he would have been correct in his assertion; but he must wilfully have shut his eyes against the numerous facts which had occurred, and against the debates of the National Assembly, if he did not know that neither the object of the revolutionary leaders, nor the tendency of their measures, was the good of the people. The King, indeed, had that object nearest his heart; and he would have accomplished it, had his efforts not been counteracted by the machinations of the factious demagogues in the National Assembly.

He declared that he never wished to conceal his political opinions; but he did not approve of having a day fixed for catechising him.—He acknowledged that he had learned more from Mr. Burke than from all books and all men.—All his political knowledge was drawn from Mr. Burke's writings, speeches, and familiar conversation. During the American war, *they had rejoiced together at the successes of a Washington, and sympathized, almost in tears, for the fall of a Montgomery.** To deny that the British constitution was founded upon the rights of man, he considered as nothing more nor less than an attempt to libel that constitution; and no book which Mr. Burke could cite, no words which he might use in debate, however

* The reader will recollect, that WASHINGTON was the Commander in Chief of a *rebel* army; and that MONTGOMERY fell in the cause of *rebellion*, fighting against the troops of his, and Mr. Fox's, lawful Sovereign.---It is not surprising that, when the American rebels met with such supporters in the legislative council of the mother country, their cause should succeed; but it is very surprising that a member of the British House of Commons should so far forget the allegiance which he owed to his King, should so far lose sight of that decency and respect which were due to the House, to his constituents, and to his country, as to make his encouragement of rebels the subject of his boast;---and it is still more surprising, that there should not have been a single member of the House of Commons to call him to order!

ingenious, eloquent, and able, as all his writings and speeches undoubtedly were, should ever induce him to change, or abandon this opinion.

If there be wisdom in fortifying the mind against conviction, this declaration of Mr. Fox was eminently wise: but it behoved him, at least, to shew on what he founded his opinion, before he expressed his resolution never to abandon it. The nonsensical rhapsody to which the sages of regenerated France had ridiculously applied the pompous title of "The Rights of Man," had been the just object of Mr. Burke's derision. If Mr. Fox meant to say, that the British constitution was founded on *such* rights, it was *he* who libelled that constitution, and not Mr. Burke; and if he did not mean to say so, his observation was irrelevant, and could not apply to any part of Mr. Burke's speech.—It was calculated, however, to mislead the multitude, and it certainly tended to embolden the factious members of the different revolutionary societies, now established in the country.

Mr. Burke, in reply, truly remarked, that Mr. Fox's speech was one of the most disorderly ever delivered in that House.—His public conduct, words, and writings, had not only been misrepresented and arraigned in the severest terms, but confidential conversations had been

unfairly brought forward for the purpose of attempting to prove his political inconsistency. —Such were the instances of kindness, which he had received from one whom he had always considered as his warmest friend. He could not conceive that the manner in which Mr. Fox had accused him of having spoken without information, and unsupported by facts, appeared to manifest any great degree of tenderness towards him. On the subject, however, of the French revolution, uninformed as he might be supposed to be, he had not the least objection to meet Mr. Fox hand to hand, and foot to foot, in a fair and temperate discussion.

Mr. Burke disclaimed, in the most pointed manner, the having introduced this subject of discussion for the purpose of stigmatizing certain principles advanced by Mr. Fox on a former occasion. He had made no reference whatever to any of Mr. Fox's speeches; and he informed the House, that he had communicated to Mr. Fox the line of argument which he meant to adopt, and had actually shewn him all the books, pamphlets, and reports, which Mr. Fox now chose to suppose that he had never read.— He then stated his reasons for wishing to introduce the subject of the French constitution; and most sound and valid reasons they were.— In the first place, he felt desirous of pointing

out the danger of perpetually extolling that preposterous edifice upon all occasions, and in the highest strain of panegyric. Mr. Fox had himself termed it "the most stupendous and glorious edifice of liberty which had been erected on the foundation of human integrity, in any time or country."—A second motive, which had some little influence over him, was of a more personal nature.—He had been accused both of writing and speaking of the late proceedings in France, rashly, unadvisedly, and wantonly.—This charge he was certainly anxious to refute; but, at the very time when he was about to produce facts in corroboration of his assertions, blended with private information and respectable authorities, he was stopped in the most unfair and disorderly manner.—Had he been permitted to continue his speech, he would have shewn, that the issue of all that had been done, and of all that was then doing, in France, could never serve the cause of liberty, but would inevitably tend to promote that of tyranny, oppression, injustice, and anarchy.

Seventeen years have elapsed since Mr. Burke thus anticipated the effects of those revolutionary proceedings, which Mr. Fox held up to the admiration, if not to the imitation, of surrounding nations. It was not the hasty

anticipation of a lively fancy, and an ardent mind, apt to found its deductions on its wishes, but the calm result of a minute investigation of facts, instituted by a truly philosophic mind, eager in its search after truth, and accustomed to trace effects to their causes, and to follow causes to their effects. Now, that those consequences, which Mr. Burke foresaw, are no longer matters of opinion, but objects of contemplation, it is impossible to withhold our tribute of respect and admiration, from that sublime genius which, from its deep knowledge of the present, was enabled to descry future events; and from that rigid integrity, which, bursting asunder the fetters of political and personal friendship, led the venerable patriot, at a period of life when early impressions become rivetted to the heart, and identified with the affections, to sacrifice all private considerations, and deep-rooted prepossessions, on the altar of his country.—This was genuine, unsophisticated, unadulterated, patriotism; having for its motive the love, for its end, the good, of its country!

What principally weighed with Mr. Burke, on the present occasion, and determined him in his conduct, was the danger which threatened our own government, from practices which were notorious to all the world.—Were there not

clubs in every quarter, which met and voted resolutions of an alarming tendency? Did they not correspond, not only with each other, in every part of the kingdom, but with foreign countries? Did they not preach in their pulpits doctrines which were dangerous, and celebrate, at their anniversary meetings, proceedings incompatible with the spirit of the British constitution? Did they not every where circulate, at a great expense, the most infamous libels on that constitution? At present he apprehended no immediate danger.—The King was in full power, possessed of all his functions; his ministers were responsible for their conduct; the country was blest with an opposition of strong force; and the common people themselves seemed to be united with the gentlemen in a column of prudence. Nevertheless, he maintained there was sufficient cause for jealousy and circumspection. In France, there were three hundred thousand men in arms, who, at a favourable moment, might be happy to yield assistance; besides, a time of scarcity and tumult might come, when the greatest danger was to be dreaded from a class of people, who might now be called low intriguers, and contemptible clubbists.

Towards the close of his speech, Mr. Burke, addressing himself to the two great political leaders of the House, expressed a hope that,

whether they moved hereafter in the political hemisphere as two flaming meteors, or walked together, like brethren, hand in hand, they would preserve and cherish the British constitution; that they would guard it against innovation, and protect it from the pestilential breath of French philosophy. He then broke into an impassioned apostrophe to the immeasurable and unspeakable power of the Deity, to whom alone, as a being of infinite perfection, belongs the omniscience, which sees all things in their first causes,—while to us, poor, weak, incapable mortals, there is no rule of conduct so safe as experience.

He was answered by Mr. Fox, whose feelings, for a short time, subdued his powers of utterance.—He again justified his conduct, and considered Mr. Burke's strictures as unfair and unjust: he adverted to certain expressions of Mr. Burke, in the course of debates which occurred several years before, for the purpose of fixing upon him the charge of inconsistency. He thought the French revolution such an acquisition to the cause of freedom, from the dominion of France over the manners of other nations, as to justify his former panegyric; and he apologized for the excesses of the French people, in its progress, by remarking that it was natural for them to be guilty of many extravagant and absurd actions, from the apprehension

of a sudden return of that despotism which they had destroyed; experiencing the sensations ludicrously described by our great dramatic poet, when he makes Falstaff exclaim,

"I fear this gunpowder Percy although he be dead."

If a shade were wanted to contrast our own constitution, it was to be found, not in the new system, but in the ancient despotism of France. Mr. Fox said, that he and his friends loved our own constitution on grounds independent of all external circumstances; yet they thought the French revolution would do good to England; it might teach ministers not to endanger the just influence of the Crown, by overstraining it; and the people of England, if they should be disposed rashly to give way to innovations, might receive a warning from the confusions which had occasioned so much lamentation, and which were sufficiently great to deter others from lightly incurring similar calamities, though they were trifling in comparison of the benefits to which they had led.

Where censure was so weak, and commendation so strong, it was manifest that the tendency of Mr. Fox's speeches was to recommend the example of the French revolution to other nations. Mr. Burke complained of the allusion to the careless expressions, and playful triflings, of his unguarded hours, which he did not

imagine would be recorded, and mustered up in the form of accusations, and not only have a serious meaning imposed upon them, which they were never intended to bear, but one totally inconsistent with any fair and candid interpretation. His arguments had been misrepresented; he had never affirmed, that the English, like every other constitution, might not, in some points, be amended.—He had never maintained, that, to praise our own constitution, the best way was to abuse all others. The tendency of all that had been said was to represent him as a wild, inconsistent man, only for attaching bad epithets to a bad subject. Having explained these former sentiments of his, which had been now attacked, he observed, that the inconsistency of his book, on the French revolution, with his former writings and speeches, had been insinuated and assumed; but he challenged the proof by specific instances.—And he also asserted, that there was not one step of his conduct, nor one syllable of his book, contrary to the principles of those men with whom our glorious revolution originated, and to whose principles, as a whig, he declared an inviolable attachment.—He was an old man, and, seeing what was attempted to be introduced, instead of the ancient temple of our constitution, could weep over the foundation of the new.

Mr. Burke then again adverted to the endeavours sedulously employed, in this country, to supplant our own, by the introduction of the new French constitution but he did not believe Mr. Fox, *at present*, had that wish; and he did believe him to have delivered his opinions abstractedly from any reference to this country; yet their effect might be different on those who heard them, and still more on others, through misapprehension or misrepresentation. He commented on the grounds on which Mr. Fox had explained his panegyric: the lesson to kings, he was afraid, would be of another kind. He had heard Mr. Fox own the King of France to be the best-intentioned sovereign in Europe; his good nature and love of his people had ruined him;—his concessions had brought him to a gaol.—The example of the confusions, on the other hand, would have very little operation, when it was mentioned with tardy and qualified censure; while the praises of the revolution were trumpeted, with the loudest blasts, through the nation. Mr. Fox had called the new French system a most stupendous and glorious fabric of human integrity; Mr. Burke conceived, that he possessed a better taste in architecture than to bestow so magnificent an epithet upon a building composed of untempered mortar.—He considered it as the

work of Goths and Vandals, where every thing was disjointed and inverted. As to the church, in particular, it had been said, by Mr. Fox, that the French had abolished all tests, and given a complete, unequivocal toleration.—So far from it, Mr. Burke insisted that they had established the most diabolical intolerance that ever existed on the face of the earth; and created a new test, not for the sake of security, but as the means of cruelty, oppression, and injustice; in order to afford an opportunity of depriving many thousand individuals of their bread. The clergy were forced to take this test or starve; and yet France was the country in which there was said to be no test at all! He drew a striking picture of the persecutions to which the monks and nuns, and the pious few of the laity, were exposed, throughout France; and he particularly instanced the unmanly and brutal severity inflicted on the sisterhood of the charity of St. Lazarus; an order of nuns who devoted themselves to the irksome duty of attending the patients in an hospital: these women were seized, dragged out, stripped, publicly whipped in the streets of Paris, and turned adrift on the world; and all this for no other offence than that of receiving the sacrament from a priest who had not taken the new civic oath, or test! The National Assembly were apprized of this abo-

minable tyranny, "outraging at once, piety, charity, and decency;" yet had not the justice to punish, nor even the honesty to censure it.

But Mr. Fox had represented the new constitution of France as an experiment.—Mr. Burke thought, and justly thought, we had seen enough of it to judge of its practical effects; the new sovereigns of that country, he greatly apprehended, would proceed from tyranny to tyranny, from oppression to oppression, till the whole system terminated in the complete ruin of that miserable and deluded people. He closed his interesting observations, with the expression of a sincere hope, that no member of that House would ever barter the constitution of his country, that eternal jewel of his soul, for a wild and visionary system, which could only lead to confusion and disorder.

Mr. Pitt having declared his own opinion, that Mr. Burke had not been, even in the first instance, at all out of order, suggested the propriety of withdrawing the motion which had been made by Lord Sheffield.—He conceived that the constitution could be in no immediate danger, but declared, that if thereafter there should appear to be a more serious ground of apprehension, and that ground should be distinctly stated by Mr. Burke, he should be eager to give that gentleman his warmest and most effectual

support. He thought Mr. Burke entitled to the gratitude of his country, for having, on that day, in so able and eloquent a manner, expressed his sense of the degree of danger which already existed; and assured him, that he would himself most cordially co-operate with him in taking every possible means to preserve, what he esteemed, the most perfect constitution in the world, and to deliver it down to posterity as the best security for the prosperity, freedom, and happiness, of the British people.

The Canada-bill was further discussed on the 11th of May, when Mr. Fox took occasion to explain his political opinions, evidently with a view to remove certain unfavourable impressions which he knew to have been made by his late speeches in Parliament.—He now declared, that there could be no good and complete system of government, without a due mixture of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy; and, however unfavourably one gentleman might construe his sentiments, yet he considered our own aristocracy as the proper poise of the constitution, the balance that equalized and meliorated the powers of the two other extremes, and gave firmness and stability to the whole. He, nevertheless, did not think it wise, in an infant government, where no previous materials for such an aristocracy existed, to

make that branch of the legislature hereditary. Property was, and had ever been, esteemed to be the true foundation of aristocracy, and upon that he proposed to build the aristocracy of Canada, since an act of Parliament could not give nobility like an English peerage. He thought it best to make the councils elective, with a higher qualification both for the electors and the elected, after the model of the American constitutions, where the three powers of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, were judiciously blended, although under different names.

It was truly observed by Mr. Pitt, that a different impression, from that which Mr. Fox's present speech was calculated to raise, had been made, both in that House and abroad, by the debate of the former night. Believing him now to be truly sincere, Mr. Pitt congratulated himself, that he might be sure of having the aid of such eloquence and talents, to resist any attempt, at any time, to impair or destroy any part of that edifice, which, for its beauty and perfection, was the admiration of the whole world, and the inestimable blessing of this country. He dwelt much, at large, upon the benefits resulting from the principle of aristocracy in a mixed government.

Some of Mr. Fox's notions were combated

by Mr. Burke, who observed, that, in a monarchy, the aristocracy must ever be nearer to the Crown, whence, as from the fountain of honour, it originated, than to the democracy; but in those governments, which had nothing monarchial in them, the aristocracy necessarily rose out of the democracy. He denied property to be the sole foundation of aristocracy; pointedly condemning a *close*, and praising an *open*, aristocracy. A *close* aristocracy, confined to birth, would, of course, preclude the possibility of raising virtue, however distinguished; talents, however eminent, and however applied; and public services, however important to the dignity of the peerage; and would, consequently, strip the Crown of one of its best and most beneficial prerogatives. He objected to the council proposed by Mr. Fox, which he thought, in fact, to be of a democratical constitution; and he adduced the example of the general rebellion of the American colonies, in proof that assemblies, so constituted, had the test of experience against them.—Then, leaving the subject immediately before the House, he remarked, that, at a time when open and avowed attempts were made to circulate pamphlets, and to disseminate doctrines subversive of the prerogative, and, consequently, dangerous to the constitution, it was unwarrantable for any good

subject to be, day after day, holding out a parade of democracy, in order to set the unthinking many raging against the Crown. He conceived, that there then existed a run against monarchy, but this had been rashly represented as the mere idle coinage of his own brain;—he trusted, however, that the House would not rest too securely upon such a representation, but take care, in time, to guard against the impending danger. In saying what he had done upon the subject, he was conscious that he had done his duty; and hoped that he had, in some measure, averted what might otherwise have effected the downfal of our justly-boasted constitution;—supported by such reflections, he was not deprived of consolation, although excluded from his party;—a gloomy solitude might reign around him, but all was unclouded sunshine within.

It was, on the other hand, asserted by Mr. Fox, that the constitution was more liable to be ruined by an increase of the power of the Crown, than by an increase of the power of the people.—On this point these two great politicians were at issue.—In examining into the accuracy of their respective opinions, it would be necessary to consider them not in the abstract, but in relation to the *times* in which they were delivered. It is perfectly clear, that the great

majority of the people were, at this period, favourable to the French revolution, notwithstanding all the crimes by which it was perpetrated, and all the enormities to which it gave birth. Publications, in which the most violent, objectionable, and dangerous, principles of the French Jacobins were adopted and commended, were circulated by societies instituted for the purpose; — and the conduct of France was holden out, in plain language, to the imitation of England.—The necessary tendency of all these proceedings was to weaken, if not to annihilate, the attachment to royalty, which was, indeed, treated with little ceremony, and not unfrequently rendered the subject of derision.—The ties which had long bound the people to the throne were, by such insidious artifices, materially loosened, and a very slight concussion would have been sufficient to dissolve them. It was evident, therefore, that the constitution could be in no danger from the undue influence of the Crown;—and it was equally clear to every unprejudiced person, who paid attention to passing events, that serious danger was to be apprehended from the growing disaffection of the people.—At such a period, then, it was as much the bounden duty of the patriot, to throw all his weight and influence into the scale of royalty, as it would be, at a different crisis, (if, in this kingdom, such a crisis could occur)

when the prerogative of the Crown had been strained beyond its due bounds, and a disposition evinced, by the Monarch on the throne, to transgress the limits assigned by the constitution to the regal power, and a conduct displayed hostile to the established religion and laws of the State,—to give the preponderance to the popular scale.—This duty Mr. Burke most faithfully and conscientiously discharged, at the period in question; while Mr. Fox adopted an opposite line of conduct, strengthening, by his speeches, the rising spirit of democracy, and so qualifying all his praises of the British constitution, as to make little impression on the minds of those who harboured a secret wish to subvert it.

It has been correctly observed, by a contemporary writer, that this disposition between the two great leaders of the Whig party, did not arise immediately out of the events of the French revolution, and the discussions which grew out of them; there, manifestly, must have existed between them a marked and essential difference of principle, which no political event had hitherto occurred of a nature to call forth to public notice. It was the practical application of the principle of each to those great questions which it now became necessary to discuss, that first rendered the difference evident, and attracted the public attention towards it.

Mr. Burke was a Whig of the Old School; formed on the principles which fixed the House of Brunswick on the throne; and Mr. Fox was a *Whig* only in name, a disciple of a new sect, which, seeming to have adopted for its motto the old adage, with a contracted signification—Vox populi, suprema lex est,—professed to make popular opinion the criterion of their principles, and the rule of their conduct; though their practice did not always correspond with their professions.

During these altercations, Mr. Pitt conducted himself with the greatest impartiality and honour. Far from seeking to foment the divisions between his political opponents, he endeavoured, as far as he consistently could, to allay them, by exhorting the common friends of both parties to interfere, for the purpose of conciliation. He even went no farther, in his arguments, than his duty imperatively required him to go; rendering, indeed, justice to the patriotic sentiments, and dignified conduct, of Mr. Burke, but abstaining from all observations that could irritate Mr. Fox against him.

On the 18th of May, Mr. Pitt opened his budget for the year; when it appeared, that the sum total of expense was £5,728,000; and the total of ways and means, for defraying it, £5,734,471;—the receipts exceeding the ex-

penditure by only a few thousand pounds. No new imposts were, of course, necessary.—Mr. Sheridan, on a subsequent day, proposed a long string of resolutions to the House, the object of which was to show, that all Mr. Pitt's calculations, respecting the public income, and the reduction of the national debt, were fallacious. These resolutions were debated on successive days, and negatived by the House; and a number of different resolutions, proposed by the minister and his friends, were adopted in their stead.—The Indian budget was opened by Mr. Dundas, on the 24th of May, who, in a very clear and full account of the state of our Indian government, made it appear, that there existed, in that country, a surplus revenue of £1,409,079. The accuracy of this statement was, indeed, questioned by Mr. Paul, Benfield, and some other members; but the House gave their sanction to sixteen resolutions, in support of it.—On the 10th of June the Parliament was prorogued.

CHAPTER XVII.

The progress of Revolutionary Principles in England—Paine's Rights of Man—Means taken to promote its extensive circulation among the lower classes of People—Its Effect—The Revolution Society—Justice of Mr. Burke's charges against it, proved from the contents of its own publication—Its abuse of Princes—Its wishes for the example of France to be imitated in all countries—Dr. Priestley—His admiration of the French Revolution—His wish for the extirpation of the Established Church, whose clergy he reviles as "Vermin who deserve no mercy"—Anticipates the destruction of Kings, Archbishops, and Bishops—Resolves to commemorate the seizure of the Bastille at Birmingham—Seditious hand-bill circulated on that occasion—The mob insult the commemorating Patriots—Demolish the house of Dr. Priestley—Commit other outrages—Are dispersed on the arrival of the troops—These riots produced by a seditious hand-bill—Reward offered for the discovery of its author—The Author absconds, but his name is known—Dr. Priestley's losses on this occasion—Made good by the Hundred—Destruction of his manuscripts no loss to Society—Unphilosophical lamentations of the Doctor—Echoed by the Students at Hackney College, and by the Unitarian Preachers—Pernicious tendency of his writings—He abjures his country, and becomes an American citizen, after sending his son to become a citizen of France—Injustice of his com-

plaints—His rejection of the fundamental tenets of the Christian faith—French affairs—Tyranny of the National Assembly—All freedom of debate destroyed—Indecent conduct of the galleries—Persecution of the non-juring priests---Conscientious scruples of Louis XVI.---Bishop of Clermont's letter to his Majesty on the subject of receiving the Sacrament at Easter---The King is insulted by a grenadier, while at chapel---Attempts to go to St. Cloud with his family---Is stopped by the mob---Appeals for protection to La Fayette---La Fayette's fruitless endeavours to disperse the populace---The King is obliged to return---Repairs to the National Assembly---Dastardly conduct of its Members---The King resolves to escape from Paris---Mirabeau is gained over to the court---His project for restoring the regal authority---La Fayette suspects him---Curious conference between them---Death of Mirabeau---Sketch of his character---Emperor of Germany's advice to Louis XVI.---Indecision of the King---His extreme imprudence---He leaves Paris for Montmedy---Is arrested at Varennes, and compelled to return to Paris---The prevalence of republican principles---The King a prisoner in his Palace, with La Fayette for his gaoler---All regal power usurped by the Assembly---Firm conduct of the Royalists---The Sovereign attacked in the Assembly by Pethion---Who proposes a measure subversive of a fundamental principle of the new constitution---Furious speech of Brissot in the Jacobin Club---The King accepts the constitution and swears to observe it---The Assembly is dissolved---Conference at Pilmitz---Object of it---Declaration of Austria, Prussia, and the French Princes---Never carried into effect---Objectionable passage in the declaration ---Remarks upon it---The British Government take no part in those proceedings---Motives of Mr. Pitt's conduct---His high ideas of National Independence---Is not yet alive to the danger of revolutionary principles---Is sincerely

anxious for the preservation of Peace—Mr. Burke's exposition of French Principles—State of the public mind in England and France at the close of 1791.

[1791.] It has already been observed, that revolutionary principles had made a considerable progress in this country. Allusion has been made to the publications industriously circulated by the friends and admirers of the French revolution. — Among these, Paine's *Rights of Man* took the lead. It was written in a style well calculated to catch the ear of the multitude, for whose use it had been principally composed;—the substance of the book was equally alluring; it taught the mob that they were the real sovereigns of the state; and that, although they could not *all* rule, yet that each of them was equally qualified, and equally entitled, to wear the Crown, with the individual then seated on the throne. It required much stronger minds than are possessed by any of the common people of Europe to resist the temptations here thrown in their way. In England, where every man is a politician, and where every ale-house exhibits a kind of senate in miniature, thanks to the indefinite number of vehicles for the conveyance, not only of public intelligence, but of political instruction; such doctrines could scarcely fail to

make many converts, and to produce a strong effect. Paine's book was circulated by a great majority of the Dissenters, particularly by the Unitarians, and even by the Methodists, who not only introduced it into their families, for the use of their children, but distributed it widely among all their connections. One edition of *ten thousand copies* was printed, by a dissenting printer, for a dissenting bookseller,* who had been the publisher of all the principal *Unitarian* works which had appeared for several years. It was forwarded to all the market-towns in the kingdom, whence it was dispersed among the neighbouring villages; and even trusty agents were employed to attend the

* I have not a wish to be personal, or I should here name the printer, the bookseller, and one, at least, of the agents, to whom I refer. The large edition in question was printed *after* the book had become the subject of prosecution --- And I have seen a copy in octavo, handsomely printed, (in the house of a Methodist,) which was never offered to public sale. In writing the history of the times in which we live, it is extremely difficult to do justice to the subject, without either deviating from rigid truth, or descending to invidious personality.---Amicus Socrates, amicus Plato, sed magis amica Veritas,—should be the historian's rule. If personality cannot be avoided without injury to the cause of truth, recourse ought to be had to it, without scruple, and without fear; but, unless the plea of necessity can be fairly urged in its behalf, it ought to be studiously rejected by the historian.

market ordinaries in the country, for the purpose of inculcating its principles on the minds of those illiterate, unthinking, and credulous, rustics, who frequent them, and for forcing the book upon their notice.

Societies had been formed, in different parts of the kingdom, upon the plan of the Revolution Society; and, although they had not yet proceeded to those extremities to which they soon after had recourse, their avowed principles, and promulgated sentiments, were sufficient to rouze the government to vigilance, if not to fill them with alarm. A regular correspondence was carried on with the Revolutionary Societies in France, from which even delegates were sent to compliment the associated sons of French liberty in this country, and, no doubt, to instruct them in the application of the principles of the modern philosophy to practical purposes. The very correspondence published, by the Revolution Society, for the avowed purpose of proving the injustice, and *malevolence*, of Mr. Burke's charges against them, demonstrates, beyond the possibility of doubt, the justice of those charges, by shewing their hopes, and their wishes, to have been, that the example of France would be followed in England.—"We hope," said they, in a letter to a club at Rochelle; "to profit *ourselves* from

your successful exertions in favour of freedom; and that *an imitation of your splendid actions* may soon enable us to *purify* our own government."*—Again, to a club at Langon, they say by their secretary, Mr. Benjamin Cooper, —"*We* think *general* freedom must precede *universal* peace, and that the EXAMPLE *you* have recently given must be IMITATED *throughout the world*, before wars completely cease."†—Adverting to the same subject, in a subsequent letter, they observe:—"Important political changes must *first* take place in *our own* country."—And, that no doubt might be left on the mind of the reader as to the nature of the *changes* to which they refer, they allude, at the close of their letter, to certain democratic publications which had recently appeared in England, "Which," say they, "have contributed very considerably to spread among the inhabitants of this island, a more accurate knowledge of the principles of *your* revolution, which only want knowing *to be imitated*."‡ In a letter to the Clubbists of Nantz, who had sent two delegates to England, they vented their spleen against crowned heads, by

* Correspondence of the Revolution Society, &c. p. 100.

† Idem. p. 114. ‡ Idem. p. 126.

observing, that, as the objects, as well as the effects, of true religion "are hardly ever pursued, by Princes, it is evident, *that* class of mortals are but poorly instructed in the *genuine* principles either of policy or religion."*— In the same precious effusion of Republican venom, they hail the profligate Mirabeau as the apostle of liberty,—"Mirabeau, the universal friend of freedom and humanity, is no more!"—"His is a name registered in the Archives of Freedom, and canonized for the veneration of ages to come."† To the reforming patriots of Brest, these enlightened sages exclaim:—"How glorious *an example* have you exhibited, how sublime a lesson have you taught to all mankind!—The heroism which has animated your unparalleled exertions may well strike terror into the hearts of despots, and make every tyrant tremble on his throne.—The period is approaching, when the people in *all* countries will no longer submit to wear that cruel and ignominious yoke of bondage under which they have so long groaned."

If these sentiments do not indicate, in the most unequivocal manner, the existence of a wish to follow, and to exhort others to follow, the example of France, by producing a similar

* Ibid. p. 152. † Ibid. p. 154. ‡ Ibid. p. 157.

revolution in this country, it is difficult to assign to them any signification whatever.—Among the most indefatigable apologists, and the most ardent admirers, of the French patriots, was Dr. Joseph Priestley, a man better known as a polemic than as a philosopher.—In his letters to Mr. Burke, in answer to that statesman's book, he predicts the happiest consequences as sure to flow from the French revolution. He contemplates, with delight, the blessed period, when the established Church will be extirpated, and the clergy, (for "such vermin deserve no mercy,"*) will be destroyed.—And, dwelling with enthusiastic pleasure on "the prospect of the general enlargement of liberty, civil and religious, opened by the revolution in France," he rapturously anticipates the annihilation of *Sovereigns*, of *Lords Bishops*, and *Archbishops*;† and hails the approaching crisis as—

"A consummation devoutly to be wished!"‡

Consistent in his principles, his professions, and his practice, the Doctor resolved, in com-

* Letters to Mr. Burke, p. 84.

† Ibid. p. 151. ‡ Ibid. p. 154.

pany with a party of congenial spirits, to the number of ninety, to commemorate the seizure of the Bastille, as the dawn of the French revolution, on the 14th of July. The *Hotel*, at Birmingham, was the destined scene of these patriotic orgies. — But, previous to the meeting, the following seditious hand-bill was circulated by some friend of the parties, whose zeal was evidently more abundant than his judgment.

" My Countrymen,

" The second year of Gallic liberty is " nearly expired.—At the commencement of " the third, on the 14th of this month, it is " devoutly to be wished, that every enemy to " civil and religious despotism would give " their sanction to the common cause, by a " public celebration of the anniversary.

" Remember—that, on the 14th of July, " the Bastille, that high altar and castle of " despotism, fell!—Remember the enthusiasm, " peculiar to the cause of liberty, with which " it was attacked!—Remember that generous " humanity that taught the oppressed, groan- " ing under the weight of insulted rights, to " spare the lives of oppressors!—Extinguish " the mean prejudices of nations, and let your " members be collected, and sent as a free-will

" offering to the National Assembly!—But is
" it possible to forget that your own Parliament
" is venal, your ministers hypocritical, your
" clergy legal, oppressors; the reigning family
" extravagant, the crown of a certain great
" personage becoming, every day, too weighty
" for the head that wears it,—too weighty for
" the people that gave it; your taxes partial
" and oppressive; your representation a cruel
" insult upon the sacred rights of property,
" religion, and freedom?—But, on the 14th
" of this month, prove to the sycophants of
" the day, that you reverence the Olive-branch,
" that you will sacrifice to public tranquillity
" till the majority shall exclaim:—'*The* PEACE
" *of Slavery is worse than the* WAR *of Freedom!*'
" —Of that day let tyrants beware!"

As party-spirit ran very high at Birmingham, as the Dissenters were numerous, and, as may be supposed, with Dr. Priestley at their head, not a little clamorous, and as the majority of the inhabitants were firmly attached to the Church and to the King, such a hand-bill could scarcely fail to produce a great fermentation in the town. It was, not very unnaturally, imputed to some of the patriots who were to commemorate the commencement of the French rebellion; and, accordingly, a considerable

number of persons assembled round the House at which they were to meet, and hissed them as they entered. These symptons of discontent induced the company to depart at a very early hour.—And, after they were gone, the mob became riotous, as mobs generally do, and demolished all the windows in front of the House, notwithstanding the personal interposition of the magistrates.—On the next day, Friday, July the 15th, the mob assembled in still greater numbers, and, there being no adequate force at hand to oppose them, became ungovernable. They destroyed Dr. Priestley's meeting-house, and dwelling-house,—another meeting-house, and several other houses belonging to Dissenters, in the town and neighbourhood. These disgraceful riots continued, from the evening of Thursday to the evening of Sunday, when a party of light-horse, who had marched with incredible rapidity, arrived at Birmingham, to the great joy of the inhabitants of every description. The mob then dispersed, all mischief ceased, tranquillity was restored, and some of the ringleaders were secured.

In an early part of the business, the magistrates had offered a reward of a hundred guineas for the discovery of the author of that inflammatory hand-bill, which was the true-

cause of all those riotous proceedings.—A greater reward was afterwards offered by government, for the same purpose, but without effect. The author was never discovered, so as to subject him to the punishment which he so richly deserved. — Something like *retributive justice*, however, awaited him;—for *his* house was one of those which the mob reduced to ashes.* The rioters, who were apprehended, were put on their trial at the ensuing assizes, and two of them were executed. At Dr. Priestley's house, his philosophical apparatus,

* It is not one of the least inconveniences attending the irksome task of writing the history of *present times*, that the author is restrained from giving his authorities for some of the important facts which it becomes his duty to state. He must be a very vain, and a very weak man, who does not experience unpleasant sensations on this account. For it is the duty of an historian, generally speaking, to adduce proofs of the accuracy of his statements, and not to call upon his readers to give him credit for his assertions. In the present case, however, such proof cannot be expected. The reader must, therefore, be left to give what degree of credit he pleases to the assurance, that the name of the author of the inflammatory hand-bill has been known to me for many years;—he lived in the neighbourhood of Birmingham, and absconded immediately after the reward was offered;—as he may possibly have returned to the country, and be still resident in the same neighbourhood, I shall not be more particular in my description.

his library, and his manuscripts, were destroyed.—The loss, of course, was considerable, and, in some respects, irreparable.—As to his manuscripts, if they merely related to those controversies, in which he had been engaged for the greater part of his life, and which, indeed, appeared to constitute his chief delight, however acute his own feelings might be on the subject, the destruction of them by the flames left nothing for *society* to regret.—Still, the act was atrocious, as all acts of violence are; and its perpetrators richly merited the punishment which they experienced.—The losses sustained by Dr. Priestley, as well as by the other sufferers, from those licentious outrages, were made good by the hundred, in the way which the law directs, and in which all similar losses are made good.—But the jury having made considerable deductions from the Doctor's estimate, the disappointment was borne with less temper than might have been expected from a philosopher, who could coolly contemplate the plunder, and the murder, of hundreds of innocent and virtuous individuals, in a neighbouring country, while the patriots, who thus wreaked their vengeance upon their unoffending victims, were engaged in accomplishing his own favourite project of national *reform*, and in eradi-

cating "*the evils of hereditary monarchy.*"*---He vented his complaints in a letter which he addressed to the people of Birmingham, and

* See his answer to the address of "the Republican natives of Great Britain and Ireland, resident at New York:" quoted by Mr. Cobbett, in his admirable observations on Dr. Priestley's Emigration.—*Porcupine's Works.* Vol. I. p. 171.

The same writer gives the following true account of the issue of Dr. Priestley's action for damages against the hundred. —"The Doctor laid his damages at 4122*l.* 11*s.* 9*d.* of which sum, 420*l.* 15*s.* was for works in manuscript, which," he said, "had been consumed in the flames. The trial of this cause took up nine hours; the jury gave a verdict in his favour, but curtailed the damages to 2502*l.* 18*s.*---It was rightly considered that the imaginary value of the manuscript works ought not to have been included in the damages, because, the Doctor being the author of them, he, in fact, possessed them still, and the loss could be little more than a few sheets of dirty paper.---Besides, if they were to be estimated by those he had published for some years before, their destruction was a benefit, instead of a loss, both to himself and his country.---The sum then of 420*l.* 15*s.* being deducted, the *(alleged)* damages stood 3701*l.* 16*s.* 9*d.* and it should not be forgotten, that even a great part of this sum was charged for an apparatus of philosophical instruments, which, in spite of the most unpardonable gasconade of the philosopher, can be looked upon as a thing of imaginary value only, and ought not to be estimated at its *cost*, any more than a collection of shells, or insects, or any other of the *frivola* of a virtuoso."—P. 157. It must be remembered, that the jury were upon their *oaths*, and that there existed not the smallest reason for suspecting them of entertaining any undue prejudices to interfere with the rigid discharge of their duty,

they were echoed by the students of the Unitarian college, at Hackney, and by various ministers of the same sect, in their pulpits. There was a double object in all these unprincipled efforts;—first, to favour the cause of democracy, by decrying the existing institutions of the country;—and, secondly, to hold up the Doctor to the admiration of surrounding nations, as a martyr to the cause of liberty.

The fact is, that Doctor Priestley was a most dangerous subject; all his writings, for years, had a tendency to create dissatisfaction, in the minds of the people, with the existing institutions of the country, and to render them at once infidels and rebels.—What the feelings of his *heart* might be, it is not for a human tribunal to decide; but as he was a man of too much sense, ability, and judgment, not to perceive the *tendency* of his publications, it is impossible not to suspect the honesty of his *motives*.—His object was certainly to overthrow the established church, and he had the authority of historical facts for believing that the Throne would not long survive it.—Indeed, *that object* he did not attempt to conceal; and it is therefore no breach of charity, and no violation of justice, to infer that his anxiety to produce the *cause* indicated no aversion from *the effect*. The houses of individuals, of public characters, and

even of Romanists, had, before, on various occasions, been demolished by the ungovernable fury of a licentious rabble, but not one of their inhabitants had ever deemed this a sufficient cause for abjuring his country, and for transferring his allegiance to a foreign state. Doctor Priestley's vanity, however, led him to think, or at least to *say*, that his case differed from all others; that he was an object of peculiar persecution; that he was put, as it were, out of the protection of the laws, and that, therefore, Great Britain was no longer worthy to be honoured with his presence. He first sent his son to become a French citizen, and then, after having sounded the alarm-bell as long as he could, and until he found that nobody paid attention to the sound, he emigrated himself, and enrolled his name among the enlightened citizens of the United States of America.—This last act of his life, as an Englishman, was no bad illustration of his former principles and conduct;—he now divided his family between the natural enemies of his country, and those who had successfully rebelled against her.—That country, happily, had neither any subject for regret, in the loss of such a citizen; nor any ground of self-reproach, in the events which immediately occasioned his emigration.—The laws and government, notwithstanding his false

assertion to the contrary, afforded him *the same* protection from violence which they either could or would have afforded, under similar cirumstances, to any other subject of the realm; and they were enforced against the rioters with *the same* impartial severity with which they would have been enforced against them, had the palace of their King been the object of their attack, instead of the houses of the dissenters of Birmingham. The magistracy, too, and many of the clergy, exerted themselves, to the utmost, to suppress the tumult, and to secure the offenders. But the conduct of some of those who suffered from the violence of the mob could not, it is apprehended, be equally free from compunction and self-reproach. The meeting to commemorate an act of insurrection, rebellion, and murder,—for such was the boasted attack on the Bastille, on the 14th of July, 1789,—was, of itself, a virtual insult to every loyal and well-disposed person, in the town and neighbourhood.—Had that never taken place, the riots had never occurred, and the lives of some of his Majesty's subjects would have been spared.—And, again, had not the loyal part of the community been further insulted, by the publication of the seditious hand-bill, which it was impossible not to connect with the persons attending the meeting, the public peace, in all

probability, had never been disturbed. — 'Tis true, those persons afterwards disavowed the hand-bill, and offered a reward for the apprehension of its author; but this step was not taken till *after* the riots, nor till *after* the author had absconded; and, as he was connected with many of them, it is scarcely credible that they should not have been apprized of his conduct, and of his movements. — At all events, they ought to have disavowed the hand-bill, and to have expressed their abhorrence of it, *before* the meeting, in which case their sincerity would have been exposed to less suspicion.—When these circumstances are duly considered, and when it is further remembered, that Doctor Priestley, and his followers, had been long in the habit of reviling that government, which the great majority of the people respected; of insulting that religion which they revered; and of loosening, as far as they could, all the ties of subordination, and all the bonds of duty, it will probably be inferred, that the Doctor* should have been the last man in the world to

* Doctor Priestley rejected some of the fundamental tenets of the christian faith. He had the audacity to assert, in his answer to Paine's Age of Reason, that "The doctrines of *atonement*, *incarnation*, and *the trinity*, have no more foundation in the scriptures, than the doctrine of *transmigration*." If he were sincere in this declaration, he might be a *deist*, but he could not be a *christian*.

complain; and that the populace, *so* irritated, and *so* inflamed, were the objects more of pity than of indignation.

It has been before observed, that, at the beginning of the French revolution, many persons had been led to admire it from a sincere belief of its tendency to favour the cause of national liberty.—But, whatever reason there might be for entertaining such a belief, at the first meeting of the States-General, the events which had since occurred must have effectually destroyed it.—For a more odious despotism, a more disgusting tyranny, than had been systematically displayed, as well by the National Assembly, as by the different municipal bodies, and by the populace themselves, had not been exhibited even in the worst periods of the monarchy. Whenever any sentiments were broached in the assembly hostile to the principles, or opinions, of the majority, consisting of the constitutionalists, or adherents of the new constitution, and the jacobins, they were immediately silenced by their clamours; and, in many instances, where the line of argument which the speaker meant to pursue was anticipated, the same clamours, or some pitiful chicane of the lawyers in the assembly, (a most numerous body!) were employed to deprive him of the privilege of delivering his sentiments.—

In short, these champions of liberty, as they so loudly proclaimed themselves to be, totally destroyed all freedom of debate; and no member, who differed from them in opinion, could publicly deliver his sentiments, without exposing his person to imminent danger. The galleries of the assembly were constantly filled with the emissaries of the jacobins, who hissed or applauded the speakers as they pleased or displeased them, with the same liberty which spectators, *except in France*, generally exercise in a theatre. If the British senators, who openly avowed their admiration of the new-fashioned freedom, now prevalent in France, had experienced similar interruption from the visitors in the gallery of the House of Commons, they would probably have paid little respect to the alleged *sovereignty of the people*, but have moved for the commitment of the offender to prison.—Indeed, the jealousy which these senators have always evinced of their own privileges, and the severity which they have displayed against public writers, who have presumed to impeach the sentiments expressed in their speeches, sufficiently prove, that their admiration of theoretical principles does not extend to the practical application of them to themselves.

The unhappy King of France soon found

that his resolution to conform to the new order of things was of no advantage whatever to himself, his family, or friends, as not the smallest respect were paid to the persons or the feelings of any of them. In short, the King was daily the object of insult to the patriots of the Assembly, who seemed to think that they increased their own consequence in exact proportion as they lowered that of their Sovereign. All the ecclesiastics who refused to take the new oaths, (and to the honour of the French clergy be it recorded, that there were very few of them indeed who did not refuse) oaths repugnant to their consciences, were not only stripped of their benefices, but were reviled by the populace, and exposed to every species of persecution. Among the few who had taken the oath was the minister of the church of St. Eustace, who had been the King's confessor; but Louis, who was certainly one of the most religious and conscientious men that ever existed, having changed him for another, still had scruples about receiving the sacrament at Easter, at which time all catholics make a point of receiving it, on account of the forced assent to what was called the *civil constitution of the clergy*, which he had suffered to be extorted from him.—Not satisfied with the opinion of the priest who usually attended him, he consulted the Bishop

of Clermont on the subject,—and that prelate, in a letter preserved by M. Bertrand de Moleville, advised his Majesty not to receive the sacrament at Easter. This circumstance could have excited neither interest nor attention in ordinary times, but, at the present period, when the factious inhabitants of Paris watched the King's actions with the vigilance of a spy, and with the malice of a fiend, in the hope of discovering something which they might render instrumental to their own treasonable designs, it was made a pretext for fresh attacks upon his liberty, and for fresh assaults upon his person.

The patriots looked forward with impatience to the festival of Easter, when they insisted upon the necessity of the King's affording an unequivocal test of the sincerity of his attachment to the new order of things, by repairing to the parish church, and there receiving the sacrament from the hands of a constitutional priest. Should he refuse, according to their mode of reasoning, he would be perjured, by violating the constitution which he had sworn to maintain,—by betraying the nation, and by placing himself at the head of those priests whom they chose to stigmatize as refractory because they were conscientious; and, if he submitted, they then determined to brand him as a hypocrite and a coward. The King, in order

to avoid the mischief which he foresaw would happen, wisely resolved to pass the Easter-holidays at St. Cloud: as he had recently been very ill, the benefit which his health would receive from the change of air, was the plausible reason alleged for his intended absence from the metropolis;—for, in the regenerated state of this free country, the Sovereign was not at liberty to go from his palace in town to his palace in the country, without the consent and approbation of the mob.—But as his proposed excursion would afford him pleasure, and deprive the jacobins of an opportunity to insult him, it was resolved to prevent it.—A clamour was soon excited, and even the temple of religion itself was profaned by the malevolent invectives of faction. On Palm Sunday, a grenadier of the National Guard, who was stationed at the palace, loudly and violently abused and threatened the King, as the celebration of mass was about to begin, for suffering the service to be performed in the royal chapel by priests who had not taken the new oath. This seditious citizen, who deserved to be shot, and who would, in any other country, have received an exemplary punishment for so flagitious an offence, was loudly applauded by his rebellious comrades, who repeated their imprecations at the door of the chapel, where they created such a disturbance as prevented

the commencement of the service till half an hour after the usual time.

The King, naturally considering these insults only as the precursors of more decisive acts of violence, determined to hasten his departure from Paris, and, accordingly, about noon, on the Monday in Passion Week, he left the Thuilleries, with the Queen and Royal Family; but they had proceeded a very little way, when their carriage was surrounded by the mob, consisting chiefly of the National Guard, who exclaimed, "*Dont let him pass;—he shall not go!*" These clamours increased at every attempt to proceed; and, to leave no doubt of their murderous intentions, several muskets were seen levelled at the carriage.* The King, who had been too long accustomed to these disgraceful outrages, to be either surprised or shocked when they occurred, calmly sent for La Fayette, and enquired whether it was meant to dispute his right of going to St. Cloud; and desired him to disperse the mob. This civic chief answered, that his Majesty was certainly at full liberty to go, and that, in a few moments, the road should be cleared for his carriage. But he soon found that he had lost all his power and influence over these patriotic bands, who, forming a portion of

*Bertrand's Annals of the French Revolution. Vol. IV. p. 28.

the sovereign people, peremptorily, and consistently, refused to obey any will but their own. He had the mortification of being obliged to acknowledge to the King his inability to make the soldiers obey him; but he gallantly offered to place himself before the King's carriage, with some brave officers, and, at the peril of his life, enforce the execution of the law; but his Majesty, perceiving the impossibility of proceeding, after having been detained on the same spot for an hour and a half, took the prudent resolution of returning to Paris, instead of submitting to the greater disgrace of being carried back to it.

The day after this outrage, the King, by the particular desire of his ministers, went to the National Assembly, and told them that he had been unwilling to have recourse to force, in defence of his right of going to St. Cloud, but that, as it was of importance to the nation to prove that he was free, he persisted in his project of going thither: he reminded them that his intentions and his wishes had no other object than the happiness of his people, which could only result from the execution of the laws, and obedience to all the legitimate and constitutional authorities. The president, in his answer, referred to the refractory priests, as the cause of all the troubles,—but did not dare to

say one word on the only subject of the King's address—his journey to St. Cloud. Nay, so base and so dastardly were these guardians of their own laws, that, when a member reminded them of this, all the opposition rose in a body to prevent him from continuing his speech, and even threatened to commit him to prison for the attempt!* M. de Cazales, and some others, endeavoured to remonstrate, but they were silenced by the clamours of the majority, who precipitately broke up the session. They were evidently apprehensive of giving offence to the mob, and sacrificed their duty to their fears.—Not, indeed, but that many of them most heartily approved of every attack upon the King, by whomever made, and most cordially wished to see him stripped of every vestige of regal authority.

Thus reduced to a state of absolute captivity, with none but nominal rights, which he was not allowed to exercise; a prisoner in his capital, surrounded by a horde of rebels, and by numbers of regicides, without the smallest prospect of improving his condition, and with the best-founded apprehensions for the future, it is not to be wondered at that the King should listen to the suggestions of his real friends, who strenuously urged him to effect his escape

* Idem. Ibid. p. 36.

from Paris, and to repair to some distant town, where he might assemble all his nobility, and the few troops which still remained faithful to him; under whose protection he might assert his own freedom; dissolve the National Assembly; and convene anew the States-General of the realm. Various places were pointed out, by different persons, as the best for the King's residence; it was at one time intended that he should retire into Normandy;—at another Metz was the place fixed upon;—Besançon was thought the most proper by the Marquis de Bouillè, in whom the King, very wisely, reposed the greatest confidence, but his Majesty himself preferred Montmedi, and M. de Bouillè received instructions to adopt the necessary means for securing his escape. This was settled at the close of the year 1790; but the King having, in the mean time, succeeded in buying the great hero of the revolution, Mirabeau, whose avarice and ambition prevailed over every other passion, sentiment, and feeling, the plan was altered. The price of Mirabeau's conversion and support, which he had actually received, was a sum of twenty-five thousand pounds, and a monthly allowance of something more than two thousand.* The plan which he proposed, was to

* Memoirs relating to the French Revolution, by the Marquis de Bouillè. p. 277.

procure the dissolution of the National Assembly, and the liberty of the King, by the power and the will of the nation itself; establishing as a principle, that the representatives of the people, in this Assembly, were not possessed of the powers necessary to make a change in the existing constitution; such a measure being contrary to the instructions given by all the provinces to their deputies whom they sent to the States-General, which instructions had neither been altered nor revoked; and that the King, being deprived of his personal liberty, could not give the sanction of his authority to the new laws which they had passed.—The validity of this objection being once admitted, he next intended to procure addresses from the different departments, praying that the present Assembly might be dissolved, a new Assembly convoked, with the powers requisite for making such alterations in the constitution as should appear necessary; and that the King should be restored to his liberty, and to the enjoyment of a reasonable authority. These addresses were to be supported by the people of Paris, whom Mirabeau thought he could command, after he should have succeeded in removing some of the leaders of the jacobin faction whom he had already denounced to the Assembly.*

* Idem. Ibid. p. 278-9.

Mirabeau relied principally, for the success of his scheme, on his ability to direct the conduct of six and thirty departments; and M. de Bouillè was certain of six more;—besides, at this period, most of the departments were favourably disposed to the monarchy. It was Mirabeau's intention to deliver the King, and Royal Family, to M. de Bouillè, either at Compiegne or at Fontainbleau, where that officer would have surrounded them with the best troops which he had under his command. When this plan was communicated to M. de Bouillè, he expressed his entire approbation of it, and recommended the King to give it the preference over all others.

La Fayette having a suspicion that Mirabeau was engaged in something which might frustrate his own plans, (if a man so weak, so unsteady, so frivolous, and so versatile, could be said to have any thing like a plan) sought an interview with him. They had a conversation, which lasted three hours, in which each endeavoured to sift the other, and to discover his views;—but, as might be supposed, perfectly without success. At another interview, which had previously taken place between them, for the purpose of promoting a reconciliation, Mirabeau having proposed the adoption of some very strong measure, which, to him, appeared

necessary, La Fayette started and exclaimed, "Nay, Mr. de Mirabeau, it is impossible that a man of honour can have recourse to such means."—"A man of honour!" replied Mirabeau, "Ah! M. de la Fayette, I perceive that you would be a *Grandison Cromwell*;—you'll see where such a mixture will lead you."—On a similar occasion, La Fayette having complained bitterly of the atrocious designs upon him, which were formed by his enemies, and even by Mirabeau himself, Mirabeau called upon him to explain what he meant. "Well, then," said La Fayette, "I will tell you, since you force me to it, that I was thoroughly acquainted with your intention of having me assassinated."—"I, Sir?"—"Yes, Sir, in such a place, on such a day, at such an hour; I was sure of it."—"You were sure of it?—You were sure of it, M. de la Fayette, and I am still alive! —What a good creature you are!—And you think of taking the leading part in a revolution!"*—This short conversation displays the real and opposite characters of the two men, in a strong point of view.

Such a man as Mirabeau was well calculated for ensuring success to any plan which he undertook to execute;—and, notwithstanding

* Bertrand's Annals, &c. Vol. III. p. 393.—Note.

the many and serious obstacles which he would have had to encounter in his project, for releasing the King from the disgraceful bondage in which he was n ɔv kept; it is not improbable that he would have succeeded. But Providence had otherwise ordained; for, at this critical period, Mirabeau died.* A few minutes before his dissolution, when his friends were lamenting his fate, he said to them---"My friends, it is not for me you have to weep, but for the monarchy, which deseends with me to the grave." These were the truest words which he ever uttered. He had too much sagacity not to perceive the danger to which the monarchy was exposed, and was too well acquainted with the public characters of the times, not to know that, under existing circumstances, he was the only man who could rescue it from destruction. The remains of this extraordinary man were accompanied to the *grave* by the National Assembly, the King's Ministers, the Municipal Body, the National Guard, the regular troops, the members of the Jacobin Club, and by nearly the whole population of Paris, and its neighbourhood. The procession began at five o'clock

* On the 6th of March, 1791.---His death was immediately occasioned by violent internal spasms, but these were said to be produced by excessive drinking, to which he was much addicted, and in which he had very lately indulged.

in the afternoon, and it was near midnight before the ceremony was finished. The sorrow at his death was as sincere as it was universal;---though proceeding from totally different motives and causes. To the King it was a serious calamity, as it deprived him of almost the only means which now remained for the recovery of some reasonable portion of his lost authority. Had Mirabeau's integrity been equal to his talents, the monarchy had never been reduced to that state of degradation from which it was, at last, his intention to extricate it. With his commanding force of eloquence, and with the strength of his intellectual powers, he might have arrested the revolutionary torrent in its course; he might have kept the States-General within the strict line of their duty; and, while he had clipped the wings of despotism, he might have fixed the regal authority upon a firm and permanent basis. But Mirabeau was profligate, vicious, and unprincipled;—avarice and ambition were the predominant features in his character; the former, however, was not with him the medium of accumulation, but, like the latter, the instrument and the means of enjoyment. He was a sensualist, and a voluptuary; corrupt in principle, and licentious from habit. Still, even his vices might have been rendered instrumental, in the hands of

an able Statesman, to the preservation of the monarchy. And had the Marquis de Bouillè been minister, instead of Mr. Neckar, at the commencement of the revolution, or at the first meeting of the States-General, Mirabeau might have become the advocate of Louis the Sixteenth, and the French monarchy might have been saved.

The King of France now reverted to his former plan of retiring to Montmedi; and the Marquis de Bouillè again received orders to prepare for his reception. Meantime, it was deemed expedient to ascertain, as far as possible, the precise views of the neighbouring powers, and particularly of the Emperor of Germany, who, as well from affection to the Queen of France, his sister, as from the contiguity of his dominions to the French territory, might naturally be supposed to take the deepest interest in the fate of the illustrious captives. Count Alphonse de Durfort was the person appointed to confer with the Emperor on the subject. That nobleman, accordingly, left Paris at the end of April, and, on the 20th of May, had an interview with the Emperor at Mantua, accompanied by M. de Calonne, and M. Descars. The Count returned to Paris, in safety, on the 28th of May; and laid before the King the result of his conference at Man-

tua. The Emperor engaged to send 35,000 men to the frontiers of Flanders and Hainault; 15,000 troops, of the German circles, were to proceed to Alsace; the same number of Swiss were to make their appearance on the frontiers of the Lyonnois and Franche Comtè; the King of Sardinia was to send 15,000 men to the borders of Dauphinè; and the King of Spain had promised to threaten the Southern provinces of France with an army of 20,000 men. To these troops, amounting to 100,000, were to be added all the French regiments which still preserved their fidelity to their King; all the armed volunteers, who were well disposed, and all those who were discontented with the new order of things.---The Emperor professed to be assured of the favourable disposition of the King of Prussia, and of the Elector of Hanover. All these preparations were to be ready by the end of July, when a declaration from all the Princes, and members, of the House of Bourbon, not in France, was to be published; and immediately after the manifesto of the coalesced powers was to appear. The Emperor strenuously advised the King not to think of leaving Paris, but, on the approach of the hostile armies, to be prepared, on the intreaties of his people, to offer his mediation.*

* Bertrand's Annals. Vol. IV. p. 73, 74.

Such was the substance of the Emperor's project, for restoring the King of France to liberty and power. Louis the Sixteenth expressed his conviction, that the meliorated constitution which he had himself proposed to the States-General, on the memorable 23d of June, should, at all events, be established; and the Queen expressed her decided repugnance to a longer residence at Paris, though she maintained the impropriety of quitting the dominions of France. The means proposed by the Emperor were neither wisely selected, nor fully adequate, to the object which he proposed to accomplish. He had not sufficiently studied the state of the public mind in France, nor the nature and tendency of the popular passions and prejudices.

As to the projected escape, the King had fixed different periods for carrying it into execution; but his wavering and unsettled mind, and his natural repugnance to the adoption of any decisive measure, led him still to protract and postpone his departure until a period the least favourable for the success of such a step. At the latter end of the year 1790, or in the first months of the present year, it might, and probably would, have succeeded to the utmost of his wishes; for many of the troops were yet unseduced by the principles of Jacobinism,

and uncorrupted by the bribes of the Duke of Orleans; but, in the course of the spring, a material change, for the worse, had taken place in the minds and conduct of the soldiery, whom the assembly had authorized, by a special decree, to attend the debates at the Jacobin Clubs, and whom the agents of the Duke of Orleans had succeeded in debauching, by the profuse distribution of money and of liquor.—The King, however, appeared to pay no attention to these circumstances, all obvious and most material as they were; and even to the last moment his indecision remained, and, indeed, contributed not a little to the ultimate failure of his plan. The road, pointed out to him by M. de Bouillè, he refused to take, and persisted in following another, which he was desired to avoid, for the very strong reason that it would not supply post-horses at every stage, and that, consequently, it would be necessary to supply the deficiency, by sending horses, which could not fail to create suspicion, and to excite vigilance. The King also persisted in his resolution to travel, with his family, in a travelling coach which had been constructed for the purpose, notwithstanding the earnest remonstrances of M. de Bouillè, who represented to him, that a carriage of peculiar construction was especially calculated to attract general observation. The

Marquis, at length, received his final instructions from the King, who fixed his departure for the night of the 19th of June; and desired, that detachments of troops might be posted on different parts of the road, to be ready to assist him in case of need. His instructions were, of course, obeyed; but, on the 15th of June, after all the orders had been given, and all the precautions adopted, M. de Bouillè was informed, that his Majesty would not leave Paris till the night of the 20th. In short, incredible as it is, it appears as if the King thought that, in an escape of this nature, which required many complicated machines to be put in motion, in order to ensure even a probability of its success, no more precaution was necessary, than in an excursion of pleasure from Paris to Saint Cloud!—M. de Bouillè had sent the Marquis D'Agoult, major of the French guards, a man of talents, integrity, and courage, who was perfectly acquainted with the road, to ride with the King, in his carriage, and, at once, to serve him as a guide, and a protector. But, posterity will scarcely credit the fact, that a personage so truly important as this nobleman was, on such an occasion, was prevented from taking his destined place, by the obstinate vanity of a foolish woman; a Madame de

Tourzel, who claimed her *right* of accompanying the royal children, to whom she was governess!

The event of this attempt is well-known. On the night of the King's departure, M. de la Fayette was seen crossing the Carousel, where the carriage destined for the King was waiting; at the moment when the Queen, and the Dauphin, who followed the King, arrived, he was seen to pass a second time; and there seems to be good reason for believing that he had strong suspicions of the King's intention, if he were not absolutely apprized of the fact. The harness of his Majesty's coach broke upon the road; an accident, the possibility of which common prudence would have foreseen and provided against; and he was detained two hours, at one place, while it was repaired. Some of the officers, whom M. de Bouillè had sent with the detachments of troops, because the King did not arrive at their posts at the expected hour, chose to infer that he would not come, and, most inexcusably, withdrew their men. In short, one act of imprudence succeeded another; blunder on blunder was committed; his Majesty was stopped on his arrival at Varennes, about half-past eleven at night; the few troops stationed there, refused to obey their officers; and, about seven in the morning, an aide-de-camp to La Fayette,

arrived, and compelled the King to return immediately to the capital. An unaccountable delay took place in apprizing M. de Bouillè of these facts; and when he was informed of them, it was too late to repair the evil.

As the consternation of the National Assembly was great, at the news of the King's escape, so was their exultation on receiving the intelligence of his return, which reached them in the evening of the 22d of June.—A republican spirit now began to display itself in the most unequivocal manner. The trial, and deposition of the King, were subjects of conversation and debate in the metropolis; and the Assembly passed decrees, by which they virtually stripped him of the little portion of authority which their mongrel-constitution had assigned to him; and arrogated all the essentials of the executive power to themselves. The palace of the Thuilleries was now, literally, a prison, and La Fayette the gaoler; who, with all the meanness of a little mind, added insult to injury, and directed that no persons, but such as had his orders, should be admitted to the royal presence, extending his prohibition even to the members of the Assembly!

A faithful delineation of the state of the kingdom, at this critical period, was contained in

one of the declarations of the loyal members of the National Assembly, who, since the King's return to Paris, had taken scarcely any part in their discussions, and had generally observed a mournful silence. "In the midst, said" they, "of the insults offered to the Monarch, and to his august family, what has the monarchy become? The National Assembly have concentrated in themselves the whole regal authority;—the great seal has been laid upon their table;—their decrees are to be put in execution without the sanction of the Crown;—they give direct orders to all the agents of the executive power;—they cause oaths to be administered in their name, in which Frenchmen no longer find even the name of their King;—commissioners, appointed by them alone, are going through the provinces to administer the oaths which they exact, and to give orders to the army.—Thus, at the very moment when the inviolability of the sacred person of the Monarch was annihilated, the monarchy was destroyed; even the appearance of royalty no longer exists: a republican *inter-regnum* is substituted in its stead.

"Far be it," continued these consistent defenders of the constitutional rights of the Crown, "from those who know the rules of our conduct, and we dare hope that there are few Frenchmen who are not satisfied with them,

to imagine that we could have consented to those decrees.—They are not only repugnant to our principles, but grievous to our hearts; never did we more painfully feel the rigours of our duty, or more lament the fatal consequences, drawn from the trust delegated to us, than when we were compelled to witness acts which we considered as criminal outrages;—than when our principal speakers, become timid for the first time, were compelled to observe a profound silence, that they might not involve a cause so sacred in the contumely which our adversaries have but too well succeeded in casting upon us. Until the present disastrous period we could embrace, at least, the phantom of the monarchy;—we fought to preserve its relics;—and the hope of preserving it justified our endeavours. Now, the last blow has been given to the monarchy; but, deprived of these motives, duties of another kind present themselves.—The Monarch exists;—he is a captive! It is for the interest of the King we must rally; it is for him, for his family, for the loved blood of the *Bourbons*, that we should remain at our post, and watch over so precious a deposit.—We will, therefore, still perform this sacred duty, which alone must be our excuse; and we will thus prove that, in our hearts, the Monarch and the Monarchy are inseparable.

"But," pursued these worthy gentlemen,

" while we perform this urgent duty, our constituents must not expect us to interfere with any subject of a different nature. When one interest can alone force us to sit with those who have erected an irregular republic on the ruins of the monarchy, to that interest we shall exclusively devote ourselves. From this moment a profound silence, on whatever does not relate to it will mark our sorrow, and be, at the same time, the only mark of our constant opposition to all the decrees of the Assembly.—Consequently, we shall continue, from the sole motive of not abandoning the interests of the King, and of the Royal Family, to attend the deliberations of the National Assembly; but, as we cannot approve their principles, nor acknowledge the lawfulness of their decrees, we shall henceforth take no part in discussions which do not relate solely to those interests which it is our determination to defend."

This declaration, which was signed by two hundred and ninety members, the majority of the National Assembly would not suffer to be read! In the month of July, Pethion uttered a violent philippic, in the Assembly, against the inviolability of the Sovereign, and moved that he should be arraigned and tried. Although this motion was in direct opposition to the fundamental principles of the new constitution, it

was nevertheless favourably received by the jacobins in the Assembly, and was discussed on two successive days.—It was, however, ultimately rejected; but its rejection became the pretext for exciting the mob to fresh acts of outrage; and Mr. Brissot, who now began to make himself conspicuous, *read* a speech at the jacobin club, inculcating the same principles there which Pethion had already laboured to enforce in the National Assembly; which speech was printed and circulated throughout the country, which was deluged with republican pamphlets. The Assembly, which, in innumerable instances, had greatly exceeded its powers, and which, indeed, would suffer no bounds to be prescribed to its authority, even suffered a petition of the rabble to be read at their bar, in which their Sovereign was openly branded as *a perjured traitor!* Indeed, they had been so much accustomed to talk treason themselves, that it would have ill-become them to punish others for exercising the same freedom.

In the month of September, the constitutional labours of the Assembly were completed, and the precious code of anarchy, which they had formed, was submitted to the unconditional acceptance of their imprisoned Monarch. On the 13th of that month the unhappy Louis declared his acquiescence, in a letter, which he

afterwards confirmed in person, when he took the oath prescribed by the Assembly; and, on the 30th of September, 1791, the Assembly itself was dissolved; having, in less than three years, abolished institutions, and destroyed a monarchy, which had subsisted for ages.

By this unconditional acceptance of the new constitution, the King of France afforded a pretext to the Emperor of Germany, and the other confederated powers, who had undertaken to interfere for the purpose of restoring him to liberty, but who, in fact, were extremely averse from the adoption of hostile and decisive measures, to depart from the *conditional* obligations which they had imposed on themselves in the memorable declaration of *Pilnitz*. No public transaction has been the subject of more calumny, or of greater misrepresentation, than the declaration in question,—though nothing could be more justifiable in its object, nor more simple in its nature. The Emperor and the King of Prussia, having some state-matters of importance to settle, resolved to do it in person;—and, for this purpose, they met at the castle of Pilnitz, on the 25th of August. Here, the Count d'Artois and M. de Calonne had an interview with their Majesties, when it was determined, that a declaration should be drawn up, expressive of their sense of the situation in which the King of

37271

France was placed, and of the means necessary for restoring to him the power of thinking and of acting for himself, freely and without danger. This declaration was finally settled on the evening of the 27th of August, in the presence of the Emperor of Germany, the King of Prussia, the Count d'Artois, marshal de Lacy, M. de Calonne, M. Spielmann, and M. Bischofswerder. The declaration stated, that the Emperor, and the King of Prussia, having heard the desires and the representations of MONSIEUR, and his royal highness, the Count *d'Artois*, declared conjointly, that they considered the situation in which the King of France was then placed, as a matter which concerned the interest of every Sovereign in Europe; they expressed a hope that that interest would not fail to be acknowledged by the powers whose assistance was required; and that, consequently, they would not refuse to employ, in conjunction with their Majesties, the most efficacious means, according to their abilities, for putting the King of France in a situation to establish, in perfect liberty, the foundations of a monarchical government, equally agreeable to the rights of Sovereigns and the welfare of the French; *then, and in that case*, their Majesties were determined to act promptly, and by mutual consent, with the forces necessary to obtain the end proposed by all of them; and, in the mean-

time, they would give orders for their troops to be ready for actual service.

As the *condition* of carrying this plan into effect was the co-operation of all the leading powers of the Continent, and as that co-operation was not obtained, it followed, of course, that the declaration itself remained a mere nullity. It is evident, from the whole tenour of it, that the monarchs who signed it entertained no hostile disposition, and cherished no hostile designs, against France. Had such been the case, they would, it is conceived, have prepared a declaration, couched in different terms, and have forborne to make it public, until their armies had entered the French territories. It is not, indeed, either customary or natural, for Sovereigns to apprize the object of their attack of their intention to assail them; and hence it is manifest, that the declaration of Pilnitz was published rather with the hope of inducing the National Assembly to change the situation of the King themselves, than with any serious thought or expectation of producing that change by force. The declaration itself, though professed to be worded with great caution, is highly objectionable; it avows a resolution to put the King of France in a situation *to establish the foundation of a monarchical government*, in a kingdom where a monarchy had

been established for fourteen centuries!—Here was a tacit admission, of the right of the National Assembly, in express contradiction both to the nature of their delegated trust, and to the positive instructions of their constituents, to subvert and abolish the ancient monarchy of France.—It would, indeed, have been unwise, and perhaps dangerous to the personal safety of Louis the Sixteenth, to avow a wish to restore the King to all his former plenitude of power;—but it would have been both politic and proper to avoid all expressions which could fairly be construed into an acknowledgement of an imaginary right, the existence of which would render every throne in Europe insecure. The occasion did not call for any such expression as that used in the declaration; and it might have been otherwise worded, without any such admission on the one hand, and without any detriment to the object in view, on the other.—The objectionable passage might have been thus changed: "To employ the most efficacious means to put the King of France in a situation to establish, in perfect liberty, the monarchical constitution of the realm, with such modifications, restrictions, and provisions, as shall fix, on a permanent basis, the lawful rights of the Sovereign, and the constitutional

freedom of the subject." Such a declaration would have embraced every object which the associated monarchs professed to have in view, without affording the smallest sanction, either expressed or implied, to the revolutionary doctrines, or the smallest ground of apprehension, that any intention existed to establish a despotic government in France.

The declaration, however, was not known to Louis the Sixteenth sufficiently soon to alter his intentions respecting the new constitution; nor is it, indeed, probable that it would have produced such an effect, had it been communicated to him at an earlier period. The letter of his two brothers, which is much more energetic than the declaration itself, and to which the declaration was annexed, was not written till the 10th of September.—The King's acceptance of the new constitution destroyed the object of the declaration, and put a stop to all the preparations for carrying it into effect.

It is to be observed, that, neither in the conference holden at Mantua, nor in that which preceded the declaration of Pilnitz, was the smallest intimation given, that the British government would take a part in any of the measures which the continental powers might

think proper to adopt for the personal safety of the French King, or for the security of their own dominions, against the principles and example of the revolutionists in France. At Mantua, the Emperor of Germany expressly declared, in the written document, which was to be laid before Louis the Sixteenth, "The *neutrality* of England may be relied on."*—Whence it is apparent, that he had rather apprehended the hostility of England, than entertained hopes of her co-operation and support.—At Pilnitz, not the smallest allusion appears to have been made to this country; and, indeed, it is perfectly clear, from a passage in the letter, which MONSIEUR and the Count *D'Artois* addressed to their Royal Brother, that the British minister had not the smallest intention of interfering, directly or indirectly, with the internal concerns of France.—"There is no reason to fear," said the Princes, "that the British nation, too generous to frustrate what it knows to be just, too enlightened not to desire what is material to her own tranquillity, will oppose the views of this noble and irresistible confederacy."† Mr. Pitt, indeed, was not yet sufficiently alive to the dangers resulting from the dissemination of revolutionary princi-

* Bertrand's Annals. Vol. IV. p. 72.

† Idem. Ibid. Vol. IV. Appendix. p. 162.

ples, and from the contemplation of revolutionary practices. A firm friend to the liberty of the subject, in every state, he still hoped that the violent changes which had taken place in France might give way to a more sober and rational system of conduct; that the popular commotions which prevailed in that country might subside into a national calm; and that, at all events, the French government would be sufficiently occupied, with the means of confirming and consolidating the new order of things, not to have leisure, however disposed, for the invasion of the neighbouring states, and for the interruption of the general tranquillity.—His high notions of national independence rendered him averse from all interference with the internal concerns of foreign nations, and resolute not to interfere with the affairs of France, without the existence of a clear and paramount necessity.—He could not fail, too, to perceive, that there was a strong and violent party formed in this country in favour of the French revolution, and not only enthusiastically attached to the abstract principles upon which it was founded, but evidently solicitous for their practical application to all other governments, not excepting their own. When to those powerful motives was superadded an anxious desire to improve the internal resources

of the country, to extend her commerce, to reduce her taxes, and to diminish her debts, the sincerity of Mr. Pitt's wishes for the preservation of peace, and, consequently, of his forbearance to enter into any confederacy of the continental powers, for a forcible interference in behalf of the French Monarch, can neither excite wonder, nor justify disbelief.

Mr. Burke, who appreciated, better than any man, the nature of the new French principles, their tendency, and their effect, thus represented them to his countrymen, at this period.—" The political dogma, which, upon the new French system, is to unite the factions of different nations, turns on this; 'That the 'majority, told by the head, of taxable people 'in every country, is the perpetual, natural, 'unceasing, indefeasible, sovereign; that this 'majority is perfectly master of the form, as 'well as the administration, of the state; and 'that the magistrates, under whatever names 'they are called, are only functionaries to obey 'the orders, (general as laws, or particular as 'decrees) which that majority may make; that 'this is the only natural government; that all 'others are tyranny and usurpation.'

" In order to reduce this dogma into practice, the republicans in France, and their associates in other countries, make it always their

business, and often their public profession, to destroy all traces of ancient establishments, and to form a new commonwealth in each country, upon the basis of the French *Rights of Men.*— On the principle of these rights, they mean to institute, in every country, and, as it were, the germe of the whole, parochial governments, for the purpose of what they call equal representation. From them is to grow, by some media, a general council and representative of all the parochial governments.—In that representative is to be vested the whole national power, totally abolishing the hereditary name and office; levelling all conditions of men, (except where money *must* make a difference) breaking all connection between territory and dignity, and abolishing every species of nobility, gentry, and church establishments; all their priests, and all their magistrates, being only creatures of election, and pensioners at will.

"Knowing how opposite a permanent landed interest is to that scheme, they have resolved, and it is the great drift of all their regulations, to reduce that description of men to a mere peasantry, for the sustenance of the towns; and to place the true effective government in cities, among the tradesmen, bankers, and voluntary clubs of bold, presuming young persons; advocates, attornies, notaries, mana-

gers of newspapers, and those cabals of literary men, called academics. Their republic is to have a first functionary, (as they call him) under the name of king, or not, as they think fit. This officer, when such an officer is permitted, is, however, neither in fact nor name, to be considered as sovereign, nor the people as his subjects.—The very use of these appellations is offensive to their ears.

"This system, as it has first been realized, dogmatically as well as practically, in France, makes France the natural head of all factions, formed on a similar principle, wherever they may prevail, as much as Athens was the head and settled ally of all democratic factions, wherever they existed. The other system has no head.

"This system has very many partizans in every country in Europe, *particularly in England*, where they are already formed into a body, comprehending most of the dissenters of the three leading denominations; to these are readily aggregated all who are dissenters in character, temper, and disposition, though not belonging to any of their congregations;—that is, all the restless people who resemble them, of all ranks and all parties—Whigs, and even Tories;—the whole race of half-bred speculators;—all the Atheists, Deists, and Socinians;—all those who

hate the clergy, and even the nobility;—a good many among the married people;—the East Indians, almost to a man, who cannot bear to find that their present importance does not bear a proportion to their wealth.—These latter have united themselves into one great, and, in my opinion, formidable club,* which, though now quiet, may be brought into action with considerable unanimity and force."†

This is a pretty accurate account of the state of the public mind, both in England and France, at the close of the year 1791, as far as it was affected by the influence of revolutionary principles.

* "Originally called the Bengal Club, but since opened to persons from the other Presidencies, for the purpose of consolidating the whole Indian interest."

† *Thoughts on French Affairs,* inserted in the third volume of Mr. Burke's Works, the quarto edition. p. 16. 18.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Opening of the Session of Parliament—Speech from the Throne—Motion for the Address opposed by Mr. Fox—Applies to himself a passage in the Speech—Condemns the interference of Government in the negotiation between Russia and the Porte—Is supported by Mr. Grey—Answered by Mr. Pitt, who imputes the failure of that interference to the arts of Opposition—Mr. Pitt opens the budget for the year 1792—Prosperous State of the Finances—Proposes the repeal of the taxes on female servants, on carts and waggons; on small houses, and on candles—His philosophical investigation of the causes of National Prosperity—Debate on the Lottery—Motion for the gradual abolition of the Slave Trade carried—New System of Police introduced—Discussion on the Subject; its beneficial effects demonstrated by experience, in the diminution of the number of capital punishments.—Society of Friends of the People—Names of some of its Members—Established for the avowed purpose of procuring a reform in Parliament—Mr. Grey, a member of this Society, gives notice, in the House, of a motion proposed to be made in the next Session for a Parliamentary Reform—Mr. Pitt's speech on the occasion—Deprecates the discussion at such a time, and points out its evil effects—Declares his own sentiments on the question—Avows a change in his opinions—Explains its cause and nature—Expresses his

resolution to oppose all wild attempts at innovation—Is answered by Mr. Fox, who vindicates the New Society—The Society censured by Mr. Burke and Mr. Windham—Approved by Mr. Sheridan—Danger of such attempts at this period—Democratic publications—The people asserted to be the sole source of power, and the only legitimate founders of Government—Consequences of this doctrine, as applied to the British Monarchy—System of representation reviled, and the House of Commons libelled—Similar opinions advanced by another writer on the French Revolution—Appearance of the second part of Paine's Rights of Man—The London Corresponding Society—Dissemination of dangerous principles—Mr. Pitt's repugnance to coercive measures—Cause of that repugnance—Is subdued by the very principle which gave birth to it—He resolves to issue a Proclamation against the seditious Societies—Copy of it previously shewn to the leaders of the Whig Party.—Mr. Fox's motion in favour of the Unitarians—Supported on abstract principles—Opposed by Mr. Burke, who reprobates such a mode of argument—Points out the dangerous principles and conduct of the Unitarians—Comments on their proceedings at a late meeting—Remarks on the speech of Doctor Towers at the Unitarian meeting—Mr. William Smith avows himself an Unitarian, defends the Society, declares them to be unconnected with all other Societies, and pronounces them to be the firm friends of Government—The motion opposed by Mr. Pitt—Rejected by the House—Mr. Whitbread's motion on the Birmingham riots—His panegyric on the Dissenters—His censure of the Magistrates—Mr. Dundas answers him, and exculpates the Magistrates—Motion rejected—Object of the motion—Mr. William Smith's assertions, respecting the Unitarians disproved by authentic documents—Chauvelin's irregular correspondence with Lord Grenville on the King's Proclamation—Falsehood of Mr. Chauvelin's statement

demonstrated—Is properly reproved by Lord Grenville—Debates on the Proclamation in the House of Commons—Address—Opposed by Mr. Grey, who proposes an Amendment—Proclamation condemned by the Opposition—Mr. Grey's virulent invective against Mr. Pitt—Treated with contempt by the Minister—Address supported by Lord North, and other members of the Whig Party—Carried—Debates on the same Subject in the House of Lords—Speech of the Prince of Wales in support of the Address—The Duke of Portland, Lord Spencer, and other Peers of the same Party, vote with the Ministers—The Lords concur in the Address—Mr. Pitt wishes for an Union of Parties—Strange conduct of Lord Thurlow in the House of Lords—Opposes Mr. Pitt's Revenue-Bill, and abuses the authors of it—Opposes the New Forest Timber-Bill—Charges the Ministers with having betrayed their Sovereign—Is answered by Lord Grenville—Mr. Pitt's representation to the King—Parliament prorogued—The Great Seal taken from Lord Thurlow—Mr. Pitt makes overtures to the leaders of the Whig Party—They fail through the arrogant pretensions of Mr. Fox—Remarks on Mr. Fox's conduct on this occasion—State of the Ministry—Political character of Lord Thurlow.

[1792.] The Parliament was opened by the King on the last day of January. In the speech from the Throne, not the smallest allusion was made to the situation of France. The treaties of peace between the Emperor of Germany and the Turks, and between the Empress of Russia and the Turks, were mentioned, and a hope expressed, that tranquillity would soon be restored to the British possessions in the

East. His Majesty observed, that the friendly assurances which he received from foreign powers, and the general state of affairs in Europe, appeared to promise, to his subjects, the continuance of their present tranquillity. And this consideration led him to think that some immediate reduction might safely be made in our naval and military establishments.* The speech concluded with an appropriate and seasonable eulogy on the British constitution. It was truly observed, that the continued and progressive prosperity of the country must operate as the strongest encouragement to a spirit of useful industry, among all classes of the community; and, above all, must confirm and increase their steady and zealous attachment to that constitution, which had been found, by long experience, to unite the inestimable blessings of liberty and order, and to which, under the favour of Providence, all our other advantages were principally to be ascribed.

The motion for the usual address to the King was strongly combated by the opposition,

* The speech also announced the marriage of the Duke of York with the eldest daughter of the King of Prussia, which had been celebrated at the close of the preceding year.

whose censures of the conduct of Ministers were principally directed to their interference in the negotiation between Russia and Turkey. Mr. Fox, in particular, accused them of having acted, on that occasion, neither with honour nor with delicacy; and complimented the minority on the resistance of that measure against which the voice of the nation spoke so loudly; a measure, however, most wise and politic, and the failure of which was solely imputable to his own unconstitutional and most unjustifiable conduct. He considered the praise of the British constitution, contained in the speech from the Throne, as conveying an indirect censure upon himself and his friends, as not sufficiently convinced of its freedom from all defects and imperfections, and as imputing disloyalty to every one who wished for a reformation of abuses. But he disclaimed all desire of imitating those who had overturned a constitution so radically bad as that of France, and who had *justly* run all hazards to destroy it. The constitution of Great Britain was, on the contrary, fundamentally good, and merited, therefore, the efforts of all honest and loyal subjects to preserve it. It was unjust, then, he contended, to insinuate that those who approved of the destruction of despotism in France,

would rejoice in the downfall of the British constitution.

Why the imputation of our national prosperity to the blessings of our free constitution should be considered by Mr. Fox, and his friends, as an implied censure upon their principles, it is not very easy to conceive. And the extraordinary sensibility displayed on this occasion, the eagerness to enter on a defence where no attack was made, was well-calculated to excite suspicions where they had not before existed.

Mr. Fox next adverted to the riots at Birmingham, censured the magistrates, condemned the populace, panegyrised Dr. Priestley, and represented the whole body of Dissenters as staunch friends to the constitution, and zealous in its defence! The censures of other members of the opposition, particularly those of Mr. Grey, extended to the hopes held out in the speech of the speedy termination of hostilities in the East, which he stigmatized as delusive and unfounded. Mr. Dundas, however, shewed that they were fully justified by the actual state of affairs in that country, which he represented as most prosperous.

Mr. Pitt defended the speech against every attack; and justified the conduct of ministers, in respect to the differences between Russia and

the Porte. Their object had been the preservation of that balance between the different powers which was essential to the security of the whole. And, had no unexpected and improper obstruction been thrown in his way, Mr. Pitt maintained that the negotiation which he had undertaken would have been brought to a successful issue; but the popular clamour which had been industriously excited against it, and the unseasonable opposition which he had experienced, encouraged Russia to resist the demands of the British government, and caused the negotiation to fail. What that opposition was has already been shewn, but it required more than ordinary confidence to renew the subject, at this period, and to make such unconstitutional conduct the theme of discussion, and a matter of boast. A majority of one hundred and fifteen gave their sanction to the address. Still the opposition were not discouraged by this rebuff. It was a thing so new to them to have the voice of the nation with them upon any one topic, that they seemed resolved to make the most of it. They accordingly renewed the debates on the Russian armament, its object, and destination, several times in the course of the two following months, and even censured Mr. Pitt for that failure which they knew to be solely imputable to the

intrigues of Mr. Fox, and his Ambassador, Mr. Adair. Mr. Pitt repelled the charges preferred against him, and defended his conduct on the same grounds which he had before advanced, in similar discussions; and all the motions of his opponents were lost by decisive majorities.

On the 17th of February, Mr. Pitt laid his annual statement of the finances of the country before the House of Commons, in one of the longest and most able speeches which he had ever delivered on a similar occasion.—The first point to which he called the attention of the committee, was the probable amount of the future income of the country. The produce of the permanent taxes in the year ending on the 5th of January, 1792, he stated to be £14,132,000; which, with the addition of £2,558,000, (the average amount of the land and malt taxes) made the total revenue of the year £16,690,000; to which an addition of £40,000, from the produce of certain temporary taxes, was to be made, increasing the total to £16,730,000. This sum was shewn, by statements produced to the House, to exceed the average produce of the *four* preceding years by half a million; of the *two* preceding years by £100,000;---and of the *three* preceding years, as well as the produce of the year immediately preceding, by £300,000. Mr.

Pitt proposed to rest his computation on the average sum of four years, being £16,212,000, which might, in his opinion, be safely assumed, as not being likely to exceed the permanent annual revenue of the country.

He then proceeded to state the amount of the annual expenditure, with some additions, on the one hand, since the last calculation, for a provision for some of the younger branches of the Royal Family, for the government of Upper Canada; and with some reductions on the other, which he hoped to be able to make in the army and navy, which left a total of £15,811,000. Thus it appeared, that there would remain a disposable annual surplus of about £400,000, after defraying the expense of all the establishments, and applying the annual million to the reduction of the National Debt. This surplus, Mr. Pitt proposed, in the present year, to appropriate to the farther reduction of the National Debt; and, at the same time, to repeal the temporary duty on malt, and certain permanent taxes, to the amount of about £200,000. The taxes to which he adverted were, that upon female servants, which produced £31,000; the tax upon carts and waggons, which yielded £30,000; the tax upon houses having less than seven windows, which amounted to £56,000; and the tax of a halfpenny per pound on candles, which brought in £106,000; making the

aggregate amount of the taxes, to be repealed, £223,000.

He then shewed the progressive increase of the revenue, by the augmented produce of the duties upon all the principal objects of taxation, and the growing prosperity of the country, by the increase of the exports and imports.—In 1782, the imports, according to the valuation at the Custom-house, amounted to £9,714,000; and they had gradually increased, in each succeeding year, till, in the year 1790, they rose to £19,130,000. The export of British manufactures, which forms a more important ground of exultation, and a more decisive criterion of national prosperity, amounted, in 1782, to £9,919,000, and in 1790 to £16,420,000;—and, including the foreign articles re-exported, the aggregate amount of the exports, from the British ports, in 1790, was £20,120,000.---And there was every reason to believe, that the internal trade of the country had kept equal pace with its foreign trade.

Mr. Pitt, leaving the dry calculations of finance, now entered into a philosophical investigation of the causes which had produced such beneficial effects. The first, and most obvious, notion which every man's mind would suggest to him was, that they arose from the natural

industry and energy of the country;---but what was it which had enabled that industry and energy to act with such peculiar vigour, and so far beyond the example of former periods?--- The improvement which had been made in the mode of carrying on almost every branch of manufacture, and the degree to which labour had been abridged, by the invention and application of machinery, had, undoubtedly, had a considerable share in producing such important effects. There had also been seen, during these periods, more than at any former time, the effect of one circumstance, which had principally tended to raise this country to its mercantile pre-eminence—that peculiar degree of credit which, by a two-fold operation, at once gave additional facility and extent to the transactions of our merchants at home, and enabled them to obtain a proportionable superiority in the markets abroad. This advantage had been most conspicuous during the latter parts of the periods referred to, and was constantly increasing, in proportion to the prosperity which it contributed to create.

In addition to these causes, the exploring and enterprising spirit of our merchants, had been displayed in the extension of our navigation and our fisheries, and the acquisition of new markets indifferent parts of the world; and these efforts

had received material assistance from the additional intercourse with France, in consequence of the commercial treaty; an intercourse which, though checked and abated by the existing distractions in that kingdom, had furnished a great additional incitement to industry and exertion.

But there was still another cause, even more satisfactory than these, because it was of a still more extensive and permanent nature; that constant accumulation of capital—that continual tendency to increase, the operation of which was universally seen, in a greater or less proportion, whenever it was not obstructed by some public calamity; or by some mistaken and mischievous policy; but which must be conspicuous and rapid indeed, in any country which had once arrived at an advanced state of commercial prosperity. Simple, and obvious, as this principle was, and felt and observed as it must have been, in a greater or less degree, even from the earliest periods, Mr. Pitt doubted, whether it had ever been fully developed and sufficiently explained, but in the writings of an author of our own times, (Dr. Adam Smith, in his Treatise on the Wealth of Nations) whose extensive knowledge of detail, and depth of philosophical research, would, he thought, furnish the best solution to every question con-

nected with the history of commerce, or with the systems of political economy. This accumulation of capital arose from the continued application, of a part at least, of the profit obtained in each year, to increase the capital to be employed in a similar manner, and with continued profit, in the year following. The great mass of the property of the nation was thus constantly increasing at compound interest; the progress of which, in any considerable period, was what, at first view, would appear incredible. Great as had been the effects of that cause already, they must be greater in future; for its powers were augmented in proportion as they were exerted.

Mobilitate viget, viresque acquirit eundo.

It might, indeed, as we had ourselves experienced, be checked or retarded by particular circumstances;—it might, for a time, be interrupted, or even overpowered; but, where there was a fund of productive labour and active industry, it could never be totally extinguished. In the season of the severest calamity and distress, its operations would still counteract and diminish their effects;—in the first returning interval of prosperity, it would be active to repair them. If a period of

continued tranquillity were looked to, the difficulty would be to imagine limits to its operation. None could be found, while there existed at home any one object of skill or industry short of its utmost possible perfection;—one spot of ground in the country, capable of higher cultivation and improvement;—or while there remained abroad any new market that could be explored, or any existing market that could be extended. From the intercourse of commerce, it would, in some measure, participate in the growth of other nations, in all the possible varieties of their situations. The rude wants of countries emerging from barbarism, and the artificial and increasing demands of luxury and refinement, would equally open new sources of treasure, and new fields of exertion, in every state of society, and in the remotest quarters of the globe. It was this principle which, according to the uniform result of history and experience, maintained, on the whole, in spite of the vicissitudes of fortune, and the disasters of empires, a continued source of progressive improvement in the general order of the world.

These circumstances, which appeared to Mr. Pitt to have contributed most immediately to our national prosperity, were again connected with others yet more important.—They

were obviously and necessarily connected with the duration of peace, the continuance of which, on a secure and permanent footing, must ever be the first object of the foreign policy of this country. They were connected still more with its internal tranquillity, and with the natural effects of a free, but well-regulated, government. What was it, he asked, which had produced, in the last hundred years, so rapid an advance, beyond what could be traced in any other period of our history? What but that, during that time, under the mild and just government of the illustrious princes of the family now on the throne, a general calm had prevailed through the country, beyond what was ever before experienced; and we had also enjoyed, in greater purity and perfection, the benefit of those original principles of our constitution, which were ascertained and established by the memorable events which closed the preceding century? This was the great and governing cause, the operation of which had given scope to all the other circumstances which had been enumerated.

It was this union of liberty with law, which, by raising a barrier, equally firm, against the encroachments of power, and the violence of popular commotion, afforded to property its just security, produced the exertion of genius

and labour, the extent and solidity of credit, the circulation and increase of capital, which formed and upheld the national character, and set in motion all the springs which actuated the great mass of the community, through all its various descriptions.

The laborious industry of those useful and extensive classes,—the peasantry and yeomanry of the country; the skill and ingenuity of the artificer; the experiments and improvements of the wealthy proprietor of land; the bold speculations, and successful adventures, of the opulent merchant and enterprising manufacturer; these were all to be traced to the same source, and all derived from hence both their encouragement and their reward. On this point, therefore, said Mr. Pitt, let us principally fix our attention, let us preserve this first and most essential object, and every other is in our power! Let us remember, that the love of the constitution, though it acts as a sort of natural instinct in the hearts of Englishmen, is strengthened by reason and reflection; that it is a constitution which we not merely admire from traditional reverence, which we do not flatter from prejudice or habit, but which we cherish and value, because we know that it practically secures the tranquillity and welfare both of individuals and of the public, and

provides, beyond any other frame of government which has ever existed, for the real and useful ends which form, at once, the only true foundation, and the only rational object, of all political societies.

Having drawn his calculations to a close, and fully developed the principles out of which the national prosperity had grown to its present gigantic size, Mr. Pitt drew the forcible and just inference, that the scene which was then exhibited to the contemplation of the House, was not the transient effect of accident, not the short-lived prosperity of a day, but the general and natural result of regular and permanent causes. The season of our severe trial was at an end, and we were at length relieved, not only from the dejection and gloom which had, a few years before, hung over the country, but from the doubt and uncertainty which, even for a considerable time after our prospect had begun to brighten, still mingled with the hopes and expectations of the public. We might yet, indeed, be subject to those fluctuations which often happen in the affairs of great nations, and which it was impossible to calculate or foresee; but, as far as there could be any reliance on human speculations, we had the best ground, from the experience of the past, to look with satisfaction to the present,

and with confidenee to the future.—" *Nunc demum redit animus, cùm non spem modò ae votum securitas publica, sed ipsius voti fiduciam et robur assumpserit.*" This was a state not of hope only, but of attainment; not barely the encouraging prospect of future advantage, but the solid and immediate benefit of present and actual possession.

This was a fit subject for congratulation to the country, and, after he had dwelt on it for a short time, Mr. Pitt concluded a most eloquent, animated, and argumentative speech, with an anxious and fervent prayer, that at that period of success, for the sake of the present age, and of posterity, there might be no intermission in that vigilant attention of Parliament to every object connected with the revenue, the resources, and the credit of the state, which had carried us through all our difficulties, and led to this rapid and wonderful improvement; that, still keeping pace with the exertions of the legislature, the genius and spirit, the loyalty and public virtue, of a great and free people, might long deserve, and, (under the favour of Providence) might ensure, the continuance of this unexampled prosperity; and that Great Britain might thus remain, for ages, in the possession of those distinguished advantages, under the protection and safeguard

of that constitution, to which (as had been truly asserted from the Throne) they were principally to be ascribed, and which was indeed the great source, and the best security, of all that could be dear and valuable to a nation.

After some sarcastic remarks from Mr. Sheridan, in his usual style, and a few observations from Mr. Fox, several resolutions, proposed by Mr. Pitt, for the repeal of the different taxes to which he had referred in his speech, were carried without a division, and a bill ordered to be prepared for giving effect to the same.

A Lottery being the means suggested by Mr. Pitt for raising a distinct sum, a debate took place on the subject, in the committee of supply, early in the month of March. Many strong arguments were pressed by the opposition against this mode of raising money, on the ground of its tendency to produce a spirit of gambling among the lower orders of society, highly injurious to their comforts, pernicious to their morals, and destructive of their habits of industry. It was, on the other hand, contended, that those evils arose from the abuse of the practice, and not from its use; that the regulations which had been adopted for their suppression had already been attended with beneficial effects; that if other means of

correction should be found necessary, it would be easy to adopt them; and that, as this was the most easy method of raising money, because it occasioned the imposition of no new burthen upon the people, but was rendered productive by the spontaneous contributions of the public, it ought not to be lightly given up. It admits not of dispute, however, that if the abuses of lotteries cannot be wholly eradicated by legislative provisions, the lotteries themselves ought to be totally abandoned; for no consideration of emolument can be put in competition with the morals of a nation; and no minister can be justified, either on civil or religious grounds, in rendering the latter subservient to the former.

At the beginning of April, Mr. Wilberforce again brought the question of the Slave Trade before the House, when Mr. Pitt took a decided part in favour of its immediate abolition. Though he did not rise till a very late period of the debate, he spoke at great length, and with great energy, exhausting all the stores of his mind, and all the powers of his eloquence, to induce the House to concur with him in his opinion of the question. Mr. Dundas's motion, however, for abolishing the trade *gradually*, instead of *immediately*, was carried by a majority of sixty-eight. The subject was revived on

the last day of the same month, when the *period* of abolition became the only ground of difference; and, after some debate, Lord Mornington's motion, which Mr. Pitt supported, for fixing that period at the first of January, 1795, was rejected, and Sir Edward Knatchbull's motion, for substituting the same day in the subsequent year, was adopted.

This was the time chosen for introducing a new system of police into the metropolis, or rather for taking the administration of justice, in the capital and its vicinity, out of the venal hands into which it had fallen of late, and entrusting it to magistrates, to be appointed by the King, and to receive a stipulated salary for their attendance, to be regulated by Parliament. The motive of this change arose out of the scandalous venality which many of the magistrates had displayed, and the consequent mal-practices of various kinds to which it necessarily gave birth, in contempt of law, and to the disgrace of justice.—Nor could this profligacy excite wonder, when it was known that men of the lowest class, destitute of education, ignorant of law, and possessing not a single qualification for the office, were, by some strange and unaccountable neglect, put in the commission of the peace. When the measure

was submitted to Parliament, it was opposed, in the first place, as a matter of course, because it originated with ministers; and, secondly, because it was maintained to have a direct tendency to increase the influence of the Crown, by creating an additional number of places, at the disposal of the government; and a body of magistrates subservient to the will of the Minister. Some of the powers, too, which the Bill was intended to delegate over vagabonds who could give no satisfactory account of themselves, and of their mode of life, and over known thieves whom the Police constables were authorized to apprehend at any place of public resort, whither they might be reasonably believed to have repaired for the purpose of committing their depredations, were strongly objected to, as unwarrantable infringements on the liberty of the subject.

Suggestions, like these, seldom fail to become popular, for the people generally look at the superficies of things without submitting to the trouble of investigating causes, or of examining the nature of probable effects. In the present instance, however, the good sense of the public prevailed over the prejudiced representations of individuals, and the Parliament consented to make the *experiment*; for,

as an *experiment*, the bill was intended; and, on that account, its duration was limited to five years. The measure has been found, by experience, most fully to answer the purpose for which it was framed. Every temptation to peculation is removed by the obligation to account, on oath, to the government, for all fees taken at the respective public offices, established by the act;—which fees are devoted to the public use; while, from the first establishment of this system to the present time, a period of sixteen years, not a single action or complaint has been preferred against any one of the magistrates, for misconduct, or for any breach of duty; while the apprehensions professed, respecting their subserviency to the minister of the day, have been proved to be destitute of foundation. Great public benefits, too, have been derived from the measure, in the diminution of capital offences, and in the progressive decrease of capital punishments;* an object of great importance to every state. Still, it cannot be denied that regulations of police are, in a greater or less degree, of *necessity*, encroachments on the liberty of the subject;—and, therefore, it is that, in all free countries, the police is much more lax, and

* See Appendix (A.)

crimes much more frequent, than in arbitrary States. The only principle, indeed, on which a severe police can be defended, is that on which all criminal laws are founded, the necessity of rendering the interests of individuals subvervient to the general good. And, in the overgrown and crowded metropolis of a commercial country, it would be impossible to afford that protection to persons, and to property, which is one of the main objects of all civil government, without a strong *restrictive* and *corrective* police.

The reform thus introduced into the administration of justice, in the capital, was attempted by Mr. Grey, to be extended to the Parliamentary representation of the country. This latter design originated with a society newly established, arrogating to themselves, as it were exclusively, the appellation of *Friends of the People*; and consisting of several members of the House of Commons, some men of undoubted respectablity, and others of various descriptions,—Men of Letters, Presbyterians, Catholics, and Unitarians.—At the head of them was placed Mr. Grey himself:—the Earl of Lauderdale, the present Duke of Bedford, Sir John Throckmorton, Mr. Baker, Mr. Lambton, Mr. Whitbread, and Mr. Erskine; Mr. Mackintosh, (the present recorder of Bombay) Mr.

Malcolm Laing, the Scottish Historian, Mr. William Smith, Mr. Dennis O'Brien, Mr. Sheridan, Mr. William Fullarton, General Macleod, Mr. Carpenter Smith, Dr. Kippis, Dr. Towers, Mr. J. H. Stone, (afterwards the memorable correspondent of Dr. Priestley, and the gallant, or husband, of Miss Helen Maria Williams) and Lord Edward Fitzgerald, were among the leading members of this society. The professed object of their association, as set forth in a well-written address, published about this time, was to obtain Parliamentary Reform, by extending the right of suffrage, and by shortening the duration of Parliaments. It was in conformity with one of their resolutions, that Mr. Grey, on the 30th of April, gave notice of his intention to submit to the consideration of the House of Commons, in the course of the next session, a motion respecting a reform in the representation of the people.—Upon this intimation, Mr. Pitt immediately rose, admitting that he was not strictly regular in entering into any observations on the mere notice of a motion, and appealing to the chair, whether or no he should articulate a syllable. A call, however, from various parts of the House, expressive of a desire to hear him, induced him to proceed. If ever there was an occasion, he said, in which the mind of every man, who

had any feeling for the present, or hope for the future, happiness of this country, should be interested, the present was the time for its exertion.—The present was the time in which the whole House should lose sight of form in the regulation of debate, and apply, at once, to the substance of the subject. Nothing could be said, nothing could be whispered, on such a subject, at such a time, which did not involve questions of the most extensive, the most serious, the most lasting, importance to the people of this country, to the very being of the State. He had other motives, he confessed, besides the general importance of the subject, to say a few words now upon it. It was a question on which he had thought attentively. He was unwilling to weary the House with many observations on his own conduct, or on what seemed not exactly to correspond with what he had professed in the earliest part of his public life, because he was convinced that the question to be brought forward on this subject would involve something more than the character, the fortune, the connection, the liberty, or the life, of any individual. It might affect the peace and tranquillity which, under the favour of Providence, this country had for a long time enjoyed, in a superior degree, perhaps, to any part of the habitable globe. It

might affect us, who, from the time of general darkness and bondage to the present hour, had sat quietly, perceiving other nations struggling with tyranny and oppression, while we enjoyed our freedom; it might even bring us into anarchy and confusion, worse, if possible, than if we had to contend with despotism itself.

He thought the country should know what the opinions of public men were upon the subject now before them; and how they felt at this moment. He confessed they had a peculiar right to know, from him, his opinion on the question of Parliamentary Reform. He could have wished, that a subject of this immense importance had been brought forward at a time when he was personally more able to take an active part in a debate than at present; but, above all, on a day on which the House had no other matter to attend to. He also wished that Mr. Grey had brought it forward on some distinct proposition, stated to the House, that they might, early in the next session of Parliament, take the whole question into consideration; in which case he should, perhaps, have reserved himself till the day appointed for the discussion of the question; but, as this was a general notice, without any specific proposition, he felt no difficulty in asserting, in the most decisive terms, that he objected both to the

time and the mode in which the business was brought forward. He felt this subject so deeply, that he must speak on it without any reserve. He would, therefore, confess that, in one respect, he had changed his opinion on the subject, and he was not afraid to own it. He retained his opinion of the propriety of a reform in Parliament, if it could be obtained without danger or mischief, by a general concurrence, pointing, harmlessly, at its object. But he confessed he was afraid, at this moment, that, if agreed on by that House, the security of all the blessings we enjoyed would be shaken to the foundation. He acknowledged he was not sanguine enough to hope that a reform, at this time, could safely be attempted. His object always had been, but now was most particularly so, to give permanence to that which we actually enjoy, rather than seek to remove any subsisting grievances. He conceived, that the beautiful system of our constitution, and the only security for the continuance of it, was in the House of Commons; but he was sorry to say, that security was imperfect, while there were persons who thought that the people were not adequately represented in Parliament. It was essential to the happiness of the people, that they should be convinced, that they, and the members of that House, felt an identity of

interest; that the nation at large, and the representatives of the people, held a conformity of sentiment:—this was the essence of a proper representative assembly; under this legitimate authority, a people could be said to be really free; and this was a state in which the true spirit of proper democracy could be said to subsist. This was the only mode by which freedom and good order could be well united. If attempts were made to go beyond this, they ended in a wild state of nature, which mocked the name of liberty, and by which the human character was degraded, instead of being free. He once thought, and he still thought, upon the point of the representation of the Commons, that if some mode could be adopted, by which the people could have any additional security for a continuance of the blessings which they now enjoyed, it would be an improvement in the constitution of the country. This was the extent of his object; further than this he never wished to go; and if this could be obtained, without the risk of losing what we possessed, he should think it wise to make the experiment. When he said this, it was not because he believed there was any existing grievance felt at this hour in the country. On the contrary, he believed that, at this moment, we actually did enjoy as much happiness as we could,

or that a rational man ought to, hope for; and if he said otherwise, he should be dealing unfairly with the House, with the public, and with himself; for these were his genuine feelings. He thought that we were in a state of prosperity and progressive improvement, seldom equalled, never excelled, by any nation, at any period in the history of the world.

Mr. Pitt then adverted to the time and mode selected for the discussion of the question. Upon these points every rational man had two things to consider; first, the probability of success; and, secondly, the risk to be run by the attempt: upon the latter consideration, he owned his apprehensions were very great; he feared the commotions which might follow the attempt; and, looking at it in both points of view, he saw nothing but discouragement. He perceived no chance of succeeding in the attempt in the first place, but saw great danger of anarchy and confusion in the second. It was true he had made some attempts upon this subject himself, but at what time? What were the circumstances in which he made them? There was then a general apprehension, which was now, he thanked God, referred to rather as a matter of history than as any thing else, all fear of danger being entirely removed; but there was then a

general feeling, that we were upon the verge of a public national bankruptcy, and a strong sense was entertained of practical grievances. This was at the conclusion of the American war, succeeding a period when the influence of the Crown was declared to have increased, to be increasing, and that it ought to be diminished. Many thought, and he was of the number, that, unless there was a better connection between the Parliament and the people, and an uniformity of sentiment between them, the safety of the country would be endangered. Many moderate men, however, there were at that time, who admitted the existence of abuses which required correction, but who, having maturely weighed the state of the case, even as it stood then, were of opinion, that although some evil was to be found, yet that, on the whole, the good preponderated, and, therefore, from a fear of possible consequences, they voted against his plan of reform. If, in such a time, and under such circumstances, moderate men thought in this way, what would they think under the present circumstances? He put it not only to that House, but also to the country at large, and he would ask all moderate men in it what were their feelings on the subject at that moment? He believed that he could anticipate the answer—"This is not a time to make hazardous experi-

ments." Could the lessons which had been given to the world within a few years be forgotten? Could it be supposed that men felt this country, as now happily contrasted with others, to be in a deplorable condition? Could it be expected that these moderate men would become converts to the new system attempted in another country?—A system which all men would reject. He hoped that such doctrine would not find many proselytes among the moderate and the peaceable; if not, there could be no hope of success, and, consequently, no wisdom in the attempt.

But it seemed that there was a great number of persons in this country who wished for a reform in Parliament, and, that they were increasing daily; that their number was great he was happy enough to doubt;—what their interest or their vigour would be, if called upon to exert themselves against the good sense and courage of the sober part of the community, he could not say, nor did it occasion him much apprehension. He did not mean to allude to the sentiments of any particular member of that House for the purpose of being severe; but when they came in the shape of advertisements in newspapers, inviting the public, as it were, to repair to their standard, and to join them, they should be reprobated, and the ten-

dency of their meetings exposed to the people in their true colours. He was willing, as long as he could, to allow gentlemen the best construction that could be put upon their actions, and to give them credit for their sentiments; but the advertisements he alluded to were sanctioned with the very name of the honourable gentleman who had given this notice. He would say that there should be a great deal of activity on the part of the friends of our constitution, who ought to take pains properly to address the public mind, and to keep it in that state which was necessary to preserve our present tranquillity. He had seen, with concern, that those gentlemen of whom he spoke, who were members of that House, were connected with others, who professed not reform only, but direct hostility to the very form of our government. This afforded grounds for suspicion, that the motion for reform was nothing more than the preliminary to the overthrow of the whole system of our present government. If they succeeded, they would overthrow, what he thought, the best constitution that was ever formed on the habitable globe. These considerations led him to wish the House to take great care that no encouragement should be given to any step that might ultimately sap the very basis of our constitution. When he saw

these opinions published, and knew them to be connected with others that were libels on the form of our government—the hereditary succession to the throne—the hereditary titles of our nobility—and which aimed at the destruction of all subordination in the state, he confessed he felt no inclination to promise his support to the proposed motion for a Parliamentary Reform. It was to follow a madness which had been called liberty in another country; a condition at war with true freedom and good order; a state to which despotism itself was preferable;—a state in which liberty could not exist for a day;—if it appeared in the morning it must perish before sun-set.

He begged leave to assure the House that he thought it his duty, to the last hour of his life, to oppose, to the utmost of his power, attempts of this nature; so much did he disapprove of the present attempt, that if he were called on to choose, either to hazard this, or for ever abandon all hopes or desire to have any reform at all, he should say he would have no reform whatever; and he believed that, as a member of Parliament, as an Englishman, as an honest man, it was his duty to make that declaration at once. He wished Mr. Grey to reflect seriously on his character, and on the stake which he possessed in the country; and to consider how much

might be lost by an indiscreet attempt upon the subject. He had thus, he said, made a sort of compendium of all the objections which he should submit to the House and to the public, if the motion should ever be made, and he concluded with an encomium on the British constitution, which he truly described as a monument of human wisdom, which had been hitherto the exclusive blessing of the English nation.

This manly and decisive declaration of sentiment Mr. Pitt thought, and justly thought, the ferment which began to manifest itself in the various clubs now established in the different parts of the country, the intercourse which many of them maintained with the factious societies in France, and the approbation which they loudly expressed even of the most violent principles which had been promulgated, and of the most atrocious proceedings which had taken place in that country, imperatively required. He thus seized the first fair opportunity which occurred for avowing his opinions in the most unequivocal manner, in order to clear the principles, on which he had formerly acted, from all doubt and misapprehension, and to prevent any thoughtless people from being led away by the erroneous notion that, because, at a very different period, and under very different circumstances, he had stood forth the advocate

of Parliamentary Reform, he would now appear the champion of any measure that might be proposed for that purpose, however different in its nature, and opposite in its tendency, to that plan which he had himself suggested. It required no effort, in such a mind as Mr. Pitt possessed, to make an avowal which could not fail to expose him to obloquy and reproach, on the ground of steadiness and consistency; fortified as it was by conscious integrity, and upheld by a strong sense of pulic duty.

He was briefly answered by Mr. Fox, who declared that he had been long convinced that the interest of the nation demanded a reform in Parliament. The frequent opposition of sentiments between the people and their representatives proved to him that the nation was not fairly represented; otherwise there would seldom, if ever, exist such extreme variances between them. He vindicated the society of the Friends of the People, and maintained that it consisted of as respectable individuals as any who supported the ministry. He admitted that some of its members were violent republicans;—but there were some ministerialists much worse, decided adherents to arbitrary power. These last were the true authors of innovations, as they were termed,—as if the constitution of this country was not erected upon perpetual changes

of bad for good, and of good for better. But improvements were not to be confounded with innovations; the meaning of which word was always odious, as it conveyed an idea of alterations for the worse.

It has been seen that *some* of its members were not only "violent republicans;" though, as such, they must, of necessity, be hostile to the constitution of Great Britain, which is certainly not a republic,—but determined jacobins, intent on the establishment of a wild democracy, on the ruins of all the existing institutions of the country;—such, at least, were Lord Edward Fitzgerald, and Mr. John Harford Stone. Mr. Burke, who was aware of the inability of respectable and well-meaning men to check such furious spirits in their democratic career, could not suffer the unfounded panegyrics of Mr. Fox to pass without appropriate censure. — He severely reprobated the project entertained by these associated champions of reform, whom he, not inaptly, compared to quacks, who offered preventive remedies when no disease was apprehended. He warned the friends of the people to beware of reforms, of which, when once begun, no human being could tell the termination. The kingdom was full of factious people, who, deluded by visionary speculations, longed to realize them

at any cost; and would readily plunge the nation into blood and confusion, for the sake of establishing the systems of government with which they were enamoured. Mr. Windham, too, observed, that when reforms were proposed, grievances ought also to be duly weighed; and if the remedy appeared to be worse than the disease, it ought, in common prudence, to be rejected. This was the language of common sense, alike applicable to the concerns of domestic life, and to the complicated affairs of state. Its plain dictates, however, were not sufficient to satisfy the ardent patriotism of Mr. Sheridan, who saw, in the creation of Peers, a sufficient reason for a reform in Parliament, and seemed to wonder that Mr. Pitt, having once been friendly to *a* plan of reform, under circumstances particularly favourable to its adoption, should be inimical to *any* plan of reform, and under circumstances however unfavourable.

In fact, however desirable a rational and practicable reform of those irregularities, and of those evils which time had engendered in the system of representation, might be, he would have been an unwise man, and a very bad minister, who could have thought of promoting it, at a period like the present, when the press groaned beneath the weight of publications, calculated and designed to alienate the affec-

tions of the people, from the constitution and system of government under which the nation had increased in prosperity and happiness for centuries; and to rouse them to similar acts of factious violence, and rebellious outrage, with those which had rendered France the scorn and the dread of surrounding states. In some of these publications the wildest notions of the democratical fanatics of France were not only seriously and gravely praised, as the emanations of superior wisdom, but most earnestly recommended to the adoption of Englishmen, though the necessary consequence of their adoption must be a rooted enmity to their own form of government. One of these writers, after quoting an article of the new French constitution, on the *sovereignty of the people*, observes, with equal ignorance and presumption, "The origin of power is here traced to its primary source; all power is declared to be derived from the people. —*They have the only legitimate right* to determine on the nature of that form of government, or constitution, which they themselves are to live under. They are the *sole judges* of the general good."* Now, if this were true, it followed, of course, that the King of Great

* The French Constitution, with Remarks &c. by Benjamin Flower. P. 110

Britain was an usurper,—that he and his Parliament had no right to make laws,—and that the laws themselves were all invalid. In making the practical application of his principles to his own country, the author, having contrasted the French system of representation with the English, having bestowed unqualified praises on the first, and lavished indiscriminate censure on the last, deduces the following natural inference.—". If what I have related is true, and let any one deny it if he can, our representation, as it is called, is little else than a semblance, a form, a theory, a mockery, a shadow, if not a nuisance."—" It is a matter of doubt whether the House of Commons, all circumstances considered, is a blessing or a curse to the nation."—" The House of Commons, as at present constituted, is little more than an engine of corruption, in the hands of the Crown, or the ministers of the Crown, to accomplish measures which are often directly opposite to the interests of the people, and calculated to promote the purposes of ambition or despotism."—It is easy to imagine what kind of reform such patriots would desire;—and it is much to be doubted whether even their own favourite panacea for all state evils, *universal suffrage, and annual Parliaments*, would have satisfied them much longer than a crippled

Monarchy, and a degraded Monarch, satisfied the zealous reformers of France, whom they constantly held up to admiration, and to imitation. It could, however, admit of no doubt at all, that they aimed at no reform that was compatible with the existence of the British constitution.* Indeed, to such a height was the revolutionary ardour carried, that it sometimes degenerated into downright impiety.—In the introductory observations to the work before quoted, the author indirectly compares the authors of the French revolution with the Saviour of the world; and the opposers and enemies of that event, to the Jews who consigned him to the cross; which Jews he distinguishes as "the *high church mob* of that day."†

Another writer, quitting the peaceful paths of commerce for the rugged field of political controversy, boldly declared the French

* The abolition of episcopacy, (which the King, it is gravely maintained, has a right to consent to, notwithstanding his coronation oath) of all tests, and subscriptions, and of all laws for the punishment of blasphemous attacks on the *Trinity*, appear to have been among the favourite subjects of reform for which this writer so strenuously contended. And it is tolerably certain, that had his Parliamentary reform taken place, those *abuses* would speedily have been cured.

† Introductory Observations. P. 3

revolution " to be the greatest and most glorious event that ever took place in the history of the world:" as " the only revolution that had *completely* respected the rights of mankind:" as " the only revolution that was likely to change the object of ambition among men, and to convert it into an emulation of superior *wisdom* and *virtue*, instead of a lust of power and conquest." —And he declared it to be his opinion, that " to arraign such a revolution was to plead against mankind—to involve one's self in the *crimen læsæ majestatis generis humani.*"*

Opinions of this nature, however erroneous, however absurd, and however pernicious, so long as they continued merely speculative, were not proper subjects for the cognizance of government, who should never, without the existence of that necessity which rises superior to all common measures of prudence, and to all common maxims of policy, being founded on the paramount principle of self-preservation, interfere with the freedom of the press.—But speculative opinions were of little value in the minds of these sanguine admirers of France, who valued them only for their general applicability to all countries, and who ardently wished

* Letters on the Revolution of France, &c. by Thomas Christie. P. 59.

to promote their application to our own.—Thomas Paine, who had stood the foremost among these champions of reform, had lately published the second part of his system of demolition, for the avowed purpose of applying the French principles to practice in Great Britain; and so to tear up the monarchy, aristocracy, and clergy, root and branch. The seditious societies which had, by this time, increased in every part of the kingdom, and more especially the London Corresponding Society, whose agents were both numerous and active, circulated this pestiferous publication with incredible industry; so that there was scarcely a town or village in the kingdom, into which it did not penetrate, and in which it was not spread. Its effects soon became visible;—the voice of disaffection grew louder and louder;—and there was good reason for apprehending a most pernicious change in the sentiments and disposition of the lower classes of society, whose credulity is great in proportion to the weakness of their judgment, whose passions are easily flattered, and whose understandings are easily misled.

Mr. Pitt's education, the direction of his studies, and the political principles which he had early imbibed, rendered him extremely averse from the adoption of measures, which went to restrain either the freedom of opinion,

or the liberty of the press. But this aversion grew out of his veneration for, and attachment to, the constitution of his country; and where he saw that endangered by the very toleration which it granted, and the liberty which it conferred, directed to its subversion, his principles and his duty combined to lead him to the pursuit of such means as should appear necessary to secure it against the danger which threatened it. It was, therefore, determined to issue a proclamation, in order to put the nation on their guard, and, if possible, to stop the circulation of this literary poison. A proclamation was accordingly published, on the 21st of May, "for preventing seditious meetings and writings."* It adverted to the attempts, by wicked and seditious writings, to excite groundless jealousies and discontents respecting the laws and constitution of the realm; and to the correspondence entered into, with sundry persons in foreign parts, with a view to forward the same criminal purposes; it gave a solemn warning to all subjects, as they tendered their own happiness, and that of their posterity, to guard against all such attempts, which aimed at the subversion of all regular government within this kingdom, and which were incon-

* See Appendix (B.)

sistent with the peace and order of society;—and it commanded all magistrates to make diligent inquiry, in order to discover the authors and printers of such wicked and seditious writings, and all others who should disperse the same; and to take effectual care to suppress and prevent all riots, tumults, and disorders which might be attempted to be raised or made by any person or persons.

A copy of this proclamation Mr. Pitt very prudently communicated to such members of the opposition as were known, or believed, to coincide with Mr. Burke, in the apprehensions which he entertained from the present posture of affairs. And while it was under their consideration, and before it was issued, Mr. Fox and Mr. Whitbread brought forward two motions in the House of Commons, which gave rise to a discussion of some of those facts, a knowledge of which had principally induced the Minister to have recourse to the measure. On the 11th of May, the former of these gentlemen, who suffered no opportunity to escape for the acquisition of popularity among dissenters of every denomination, stood forth the champion of the Unitarians, who had petitioned the House for a repeal of the penal statutes which it had been found necessary to enact against them about a century before; and

which, though seldom enforced, still operated as some restraint upon them, and prevented them from attacking the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion, with the same hardihood. and the same licentiousness, which their own tenets were so well calculated to inspire. Mr. Fox, in support of his motion for the repeal, as if enamoured of the theoretical reasoning of the French reformers, argued from the abstract principle of toleration, which he called upon the House to recognize, and to establish, as founded on the unalienable rights of man, without suffering any notions of political expediency, or of practical effects, to interfere with their decision.—He maintained that the resignation of any religious right (he should have said, the dereliction of any religious duty) was impossible; and he censured the established Church as inculcating the *execrable doctrine* of passive obedience and non-resistance; thence arguing, that as the church could not be obeyed without a breach of moral obligation, and even of positive law, (an assumption which no man, it is believed, ever thought of advancing but Mr. Fox, and which is as gross a libel upon the purest church in Christendom as was ever uttered, even by its most inveterate enemies,) it would be the height of injustice to persecute any person for non-conformity to the establishment.

The question was considered by Mr. Burke as presenting itself to the House rather in a political, than a theological, point of view.—He, very wisely, disclaimed the idea of arguing on any but *social* rights, recognizing man only in a state of society. Disclaiming, therefore, all abstract reasoning, and metaphysical subtleties, he confined himself solely to those considerations which Mr. Fox had deemed unworthy even of notice,—the prudence and policy of the measure. He judged it proper to examine *who* the persons were whom the House were called upon to relieve,—what their principles,—what their opinions,—what their connexions,—and what was their conduct. He declared his repugnance to penalties for religious sentiments; but when those sentiments were blended with certain political tenets, which might lead to the destruction of the church and state, he thought it the indispensable duty of the House to pause. It appeared evident to him, from the writings of Dr. Priestley, that the Unitarians, avowed enemies to all ecclesiastical establishments, aimed at the total subversion of the church. They had formed a society for the propagation of their opinions, and had raised a considerable fund for that purpose. Their principal object in the petition, then before the House, seemed to be, to obtain the countenance

of Parliament by the recognition of their sect as a distinct and respectable body.

Mr. Burke then adverted to certain proceedings of a meeting of Unitarians, in February, 1791, at a tavern in the city,* when Dr.

* The following account of this meeting appeared in one of the papers of the day, and was evidently drawn up by some members of the society. "UNITARIAN SOCIETY.—Yesterday, this society dined together at the King's Head Tavern, in the Poultry; Dr. Priestley was in the chair; and a number of the most distinguished gentlemen in the metropolis, of Unitarian principles, assisted in the temperate festivity of the day.

"This society is established for the purpose of promoting CHRISTIAN *knowledge*, and the practice of virtue; and if we may judge from the enlightened and benevolent spirit which they manifested in this convivial meeting, the views of the institution will be promoted by example as well as precept, as a proof of which we shall enumerate some of the toasts that were given from different parts of the room.

"Prosperity to the Unitarian Society.

"The cause of civil and religious liberty throughout the world.

"Mr. Fox, and a speedy repeal of all the penal laws respecting religion.

"May the example of America teach all nations to reject religious distinctions, and to judge of the citizen by his conduct.

"The National Assembly of France, and may every tyrannical government undergo a similar revolution.

"May no man destroy another man's happiness in this world for the sake of securing it in the next.

"The ladies and gentlemen who have asserted and supported

Priestley was in the chair, in order to prove their eagerness to intermeddle with politics. Among the toasts which they gave, was "Thomas Paine, Esq. and the Rights of Man."—

"civil and religious liberty, by their writings and "speeches.

"Thomas Paine, and the Rights of Man.

"Thanks to Mr. Burke for the important discussions he has "provoked.

"May no societies, civil or religious, claim rights for themselves, that they are not ready to concede to others.

"Success to Mr. Fox's intended motion to ascertain the "Liberty of the Press.

"May the Sun of Liberty rise on Oxford as it has on Cambridge, and as it has long shone on the Dissenters.

"May the governments of the world learn, that the civil "magistrate has no right to dictate to any man what "he shall believe, or in what manner he shall worship "the Deity.

"May the example of one revolution make another unnecessary.

"After spending the afternoon in the harmony and exhilaration which the union of benevolent sentiments is calculated to inspire, Dr. Kippis, with a short encomium on that wonderful event in a neighbouring kingdom, which had rescued so many millions of their fellow creatures from bondage, said, that some persons, who thought the revolution of France calculated to meliorate the condition of man over all the earth, intended to commemorate the anniversary on the 14th of July next; and he took the sense of the company, whether they thought fit to co-operate in this design.

"Dr. Towers congratulated humanity on this glorious

He distrusted the principles of the Unitarians, as he conceived them to be connected with the Revolution Society, which had leagued with clubs in foreign countries for the purpose of

event, which, he was sorry to say, had not been received in England with the warm welcome to which it was entitled; for, to Englishmen in particular, that revolution ought to be truly dear, since it gave an example of the sacred regard that was due to the religious, as well as the civil, liberty of man.—He, who had zealously entered into the last festival for the commemoration of the event, cheerfully adopted the proposal of his reverend brother; and he was sure, now that the principles of the revolution were properly understood, it would be adopted by the public with the same alacrity. It was generally declared, by the company, that they would assist in the celebration. The evening concluded with the appointment of stewards for the next anniversary festival of the Unitarian Society. The following gentlemen were nominated:—Michael Dodson, Esq. T. B. Hollis, Esq. Rev. Dr. Kippis, Rev. Mr. Lindsey, James Martin, Esq. M. P. J. H. Stone, Esq. William Smith, Esq. M. P. John Towgood, Esq."

That a society composed of men who denied that Christ was the Son of God, and, in short, refused to believe the account which the Divine Founder of the Christian Religion gave of himself, and of his destination, while he was upon earth, should seek to impose upon the world, by asserting that they were established for the purpose of *promoting Christian knowledge*, must excite astonishment and indignation in the mind of every honest Christian.—So far, indeed, were they from wishing to promote the interests of Christianity, that it is a fact, here advanced upon the best authority, that one of their six members, whose names are given above as stewards elect, has

working the downfall of the constitution; and, in order to prove that he asserted nothing but the truth, he read several extracts from the correspondence of that society, recently published.

Mr. Burke avowed his detestation of the Birmingham riots, but, at the same time, expressed his conviction that the dissenters had, in some measure, brought the evil upon themselves, by the general line of politics which they had lately pursued, as well as by their conduct at the meeting alluded to, when the people of England were invited to celebrate the anniver-

several children---not one of whom has been christened; and not one of whom, of course, is a Christian. This same Unitarian, too, like most of the sect, treats the word of God in the most irreverent manner, rejects such parts of scripture as he cannot reduce to a level with his own very confused powers of comprehension, as fabulous; and, very conveniently, adapting his Creed to his wishes, discards the doctrine of future punishment, as laid down in the sacred writings, as utterly incompatible with the benevolent character of the Deity!---Here, too, we find Mr. J. H. Stone, a member of Mr. Grey's Society of *Friends of the People* again making himself conspicuous. Dr. Towers's congratulation of *humanity* on an event which gave rise to more acts of *inhumanity* than any other recorded in history, not excepting even the horrid massacre of St. Bartholomew; and on proposing to commemorate a day (the 14th of July, when the rabble of Paris took possession of the Bastille) on which the most inhuman ferocity was displayed, and the most horrible acts of barbarity were perpetrated, was equally appropriate, and equally consistent with the rest of the scene.

sary of the French Revolution, on the subsequent 14th of July. The riots did not proceed from religious bigotry, but were, manifestly, of a political nature. Dr. Priestley had long taught his Unitarian principles in Birmingham without molestation, and, indeed, as he acknowledged himself, with pleasure and with success. How happened it that he had never been persecuted before? How came the madness of the populace to be reserved for that unlucky moment, when he chose to sink the character of the divine in that of the politician, not only to lavish the most extravagant praises on the French revolution, but to recommend to the people of England, the celebration of that event from the chair; at the King's Head meeting.

The Unitarians having quoted the example of France, in proof of the sacred regard which in one country, at least, was paid to religious liberty, Mr. Burke compared the persecutions, on account of religion, which had there taken place, to what had been so named in England. There, a great part of the nation had been driven to poverty, wretchedness, famine, and death, for avowed scruples of conscience; here, the houses of the leaders of a certain party in the town of Birmingham, had been destroyed by an infatuated mob, on the supposition, that the principles of the party were inimical to the existing

government. In this land of bigotry, punishment had been inflicted on the rioters, and restitution made to the sufferers. In France, a country adored by the Unitarians, for the transcendency of its government, for its complete possession of liberty, and its much-envied constitution, although outrages ten thousand times greater had been committed, no inquiry had taken place, no punishment had been inflicted, no restitution made. If it were alleged, in excuse for such conduct, that it was rendered unavoidable, by the inveterate evils of the former system of religion, he should reply, that the enlightened philosoph rs of the present day seemed to have discovered new meanings in old words; that they had formed a new vocabulary, in which the destruction of ancient establishments was termed *reform*, and resistance to dangerous innovations *persecution*. Mr. Burke closed these just remarks with observing, that those people could be little entitled to the favour of Parliament who held up the proceedings of the French as examples for imitation in this country.

Mr. William Smith, one of the stewards elect, took upon himself to defend not only the principles, but the conduct, of the Unitarians, of whom he declared himself to be one. Surely no person professing the Unitarian faith, if faith that may be called which consists in a

disbelief of the fundamental doctrines of christianity, ought to be allowed to assist in the formation of laws, under a constitution of which the established church forms an essential part; when a man cannot hold even the most trifling office without giving a test of his attachment to that church. Mr. Smith asserted, that they were a sect completely unconnected with other dissenters, and *with clubs and associations of every description.* Never was a more unguarded assertion made by any man in any assembly.—So far were the Unitarians from *being disconnected with clubs and associations of every description,* that of the *eight* Unitarian stewards, mentioned in a preceding note, *six* were, at this very time, members of the society of the "Friends of the People;" namely, T. B. Hollis, Esq. Rev. Dr. Kippis; James Martin, Esq. M. P. J. H. Stone, Esq. John Towgood, Esq. and, *mirabile dictu!*— William Smith, Esq. M. P. himself. * A seventh, Michael Dodson, Esq. was member of the Revolution Society; as were also four of the others, namely, Mr. Hollis, Dr. Kippis, Mr. Stone, and Mr. Towgood †† These plain

* See the list of this society in the Appendix to the Chronicle of the Annual Register for 1792; printed for Otridge and Son, p. 70.

† See the list of the Revolution Society, in the Appendix to the Chronicle of the Original Annual Register for 1792, printed for Rivington, p. 134.

facts are better than a thousand arguments, in answer to the statement of Mr. Smith, who further remarked, that, though the Unitarians were friendly to the French revolution, it did not follow that they approved of every abuse, and of all the confusion which had since occurred, nor that they wished to see the example of France imitated in England. 'So far were they from attempting to subvert the government of their country,' that he believed, and knew them *to be firm and steady friends to the constitution.* It must not be forgotten that Dr. Priestley himself was at the head of the Unitarians;—some specimens of the firmness and steadiness of *his* friendship to the constitution have already been exhibited; and more will soon be produced.

Mr. Pitt opposed the motion, as it seemed to be acknowledged, on all hands, no practical evils had ever resulted, or were likely to result, from the laws in question, and as danger might possibly accrue from the repeal of them. He thought it probable too, that the public might imbibe false ideas of the motives which had influenced the repeal of them; concluding, from appearances, that *the House of Commons had become indifferent to the established religion,* and *careless of what infringements were made upon it.*

If, indeed, the laws in question had been repealed, there would have been something more

than *appearances* to justify a conclusion so obvious and so just. Mr. Fox, in reply, repeated his admiration of the French revolution, and declared that he had considered Paine's book a libel on the British constitution, but that he thought Mr. Burke's book was a libel on every free constitution in the world. He observed, in conclusion, that after having read and reflected much on ecclesiastical establishments, he was, from the completest conviction, a firm and steady friend to them. This being the case, it was much to be deplored that Mr. Fox so frequently espoused the cause of those who were their avowed and inveterate enemies! The motion for a repeal was negatived by a majority of seventy-nine.

The Birmingham riots, which had been frequently mentioned incidentally in the course of debate, during the present session, were made the subject of a formal motion, by Mr. Whitbread, on the 21st of May, who proposed to the House to address the King, for such information as had been laid before ministers, concerning the conduct of the Warwickshire magistrates, during the riots, and likewise for an account of such measures as government had pursued against any particular magistrates for neglect of duty. His object was to censure the conduct of those magistrates, whom he charged,

on the authority of numerous ex-parte affidavits, with encouraging the riots which it was their duty to suppress. He laboured to exculpate the dissenters from the charge of having been the authors of the seditious hand-bill which had given birth to the riots; and he asserted, that the dissenters were the *best and most ardent friends of the constitution.*

It fell to the lot of Mr. Dundas, who, as Secretary of State for the home department, was specially entrusted with the superintendence of the internal police of the country, to answer Mr. Whitbread, which he did in the most complete and satisfactory manner. He shewed, that government had taken every possible step to suppress the riots, not only without loss of time, but with an expedition that challenged applause, instead of censure. When tranquillity was fully restored, the Solicitor of the Treasury, accompanied by an able counsel, and one active magistrate, were sent down to discover, and to prosecute the offenders; and, in the whole of the investigation, and subsequent prosecution, the most rigid impartiality had been observed. The magistrates, pointed out in the motion, had not, indeed, been prosecuted on the credit of the affidavits read by Mr. Whitbread, because the Attorney-General had not thought that they supplied sufficient

grounds for a prosecution. But it was perfectly in the power of any one of the dissenters, who might be dissatisfied with their conduct, and think differently from the Attorney-General on the subject, to proceed against them, either by information or indictment. It was, however, extraordinary, that when the Solicitor to the Treasury proposed to get any facts tending to criminate the magistrates, taken in the form of an information, the dissenters objected to it, and preferred the less satisfactory mode of proceeding by obtaining affidavits, so bringing forward only one side of the question. Mr. Dundas remarked, that the magistrates could not be expected to be strictly accurate, either in their expressions or their conduct, during the existence of tumult or danger.

In allusion to Mr. Whitbread's attempt to exculpate the dissenters from the charge of having been the authors of the seditious hand-bill, the Secretary of State observed, that each side had imputed the act to the other, but it was remarkable that, immediately after an enquiry had been instituted, and a prosecution talked of, a dissenting Minister of the town, who had long resided there, and on whom suspicions had fallen, suddenly disappeared, went abroad, and nothing more had ever been heard of him.—This vindication of the conduct of

government was allowed by Mr. Whitbread himself, to be complete, except as to the misconduct of the county magistrates, against whom his motion was directed. But it was maintained, by the Attorney-General, that the affidavits, on which it was wished to ground a criminal prosecution, were highly unsatisfactory, as they had been taken in the absence of the persons accused, and without any cross-examination of witnesses. Mr. Russell, a dissenting magistrate, before whom they were sworn, refused, when pressed so to do, to let regular and full informations be taken; but afterwards sent up the affidavits, which gave birth to the present motion. He also expressed his opinion, that the affidavits themselves were, in part, contradictory, as, while some of them tended to show that the magistrates encouraged the burning of houses, others proved, that the same magistrates, being only two against thousands, had, instead of intimidating, endeavoured to conciliate, the mob, and to lessen the mischief which they could not entirely prevent. He justly conceived, that it was extremely dangerous to trust to contradictory evidence, uttered in a moment of alarm, ill-understood, and imperfectly recollected. Forty-six members only voted for Mr. Whitbread's motion, and one hundred and eighty-nine against it.

It is perfectly obvious, on considering the facts which came out in the course of this discussion, that the object of the Birmingham dissenters was to excite an odium, and to raise a clamour against the magistrates, and not to submit their conduct to a fair, impartial, and legal investigation in a Court of Justice. Mr. Russell would not otherwise have acted as he did, in adopting the extraordinary process of taking oaths, which were not meant as the foundation of a criminal process, and were, therefore, extra-judicial, and such as he had no right to administer; and in refusing to enter into the only legal examination into which, as a magistrate, it was his duty to enter.

It has been seen, that Mr. William Smith asserted, in the House of Commons, that the Unitarians, at the head of whom was Dr. Priestley, were, to his knowledge, *firm and steady friends to the government.* Their leader, too, was not unfrequently panegyrized by Mr. Fox and Mr. Grey. The latter gentleman, in a debate, at the close of the present year, called him a "*great man*,"—"*a respectable person, whose character does honour to human nature,* and WHOSE WORKS DO NOT CONTAIN A SINGLE *principle hostile to government.*"* It has already

* Debrett's Parliamentary Debates, for 1792. P. 157, 158.

been shewn, that Mr. J. H. Stone was a member of the Unitarian Society. This gentleman went to Paris in the course of the year 1792, and presided at a *civic feast*, at White's Hotel, in Paris, on the 18th of November, at which Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Santerre, the brewer, and some other revolutionary worthies, were present; and at which, among other patriotic toasts, was given, "The abolition of hereditary titles *in England*."* A notable instance of the firmness and steadiness of his friendship to government!—As to Dr. Priestley, independently of his wish, constantly expressed, for the downfal of the Hierarchy, and the destruction of the Established Church, in his letters to Mr. E. Burke, already quoted, he praised the American revolution, as having set a glorious example to the whole world, of course including England, and particularly because "they had formed a completely new government on the principles of equal liberty, and the rights of man—*without nobles—without bishops—and without a King*."—He declared this country to be approaching towards a crisis, similar to that which had occasioned the French Revolution, and if other nations should be benefited as

* Rivington's Annual Register for 1792; Appendix to the Chronicle. P. 154.

much by the result as France had been, he did not scruple to pronounce, " that great crisis, dreadful as it might be in prospect, *a consum-* " *mation devoutly to be wished.*"* If principles like these be not hostile to government, it will be difficult to ascertain in what such hostility consists.

As soon as the King's proclamation was laid on the table of both Houses of Parliament, Mr. Chauvelin, the French Ambassador at the Court of Saint James's, in pursuance of the new system of diplomacy, which the French Revolutionists had introduced, wrote to Lord Grenville, complaining of the tendency of the proclamation, and desiring that his letter might be communicated to Parliament. In this letter, Mr. Chauvelin observed, that the proclamation contained some expressions which might, contrary to the intentions of the British Ministry, give weight to the false opinions which the enemies of France endeavoured to circulate with respect to her intentions towards Great Britain. If certain individuals of this country had established a correspondence abroad, tending to excite troubles therein, and if, as the proclamation seemed to insinuate, French men had come into their views, Mr. Chauvelin

* Priestley's Letters to Burke, P. p. 40---153, 154.

asserted, that it was a proceeding wholly foreign to the French nation, *to the legislative body*, to the King, and to his Ministers; it was a proceeding of which they were entirely ignorant, which militated against every principle of justice, and which, when it became known, would be universally condemned in France.—Now, Mr. Chauvelin could not but know, that a correspondence had been carried on between various bodies of men in France, and the disaffected societies in this country, the particulars of which had been published in the newspapers both of France and of England; and that, although the King, whom *alone* he represented at the British court, neither gave, nor wished others to give, the smallest sanction, or countenance, to such factious proceedings, or to any interference in the internal concerns of other countries; yet, that the *legislative body* was neither ignorant of such proceedings, nor had the smallest disposition to discourage them. And, so far from being *universally condemned in France*, they were, with the exception of the King and his trusty band of royalists, universally approved and applauded, particularly by the *Parisians*, who assumed to themselves the appellation of the *nation*, and whom Mr. Chauvelin seemed most anxious to conciliate and to represent.

This officious Frenchman was, very properly, reproved by Lord Grenville, for his irregular attempt to interfere in any matters of internal regulation about to be discussed in the British Parliament.—After expressing his ardent and sincere desire, in all the affairs which they might have to discuss together, to maintain that harmony and cordiality which corresponded with the King's intentions, his lordship observed, that he was persuaded that it was not the intention of Mr. Chauvelin to deviate from the rules and forms established in this kingdom, for the correspondence of the Ministers of foreign courts, with the King's Secretary of State for the foreign department. But his lordship added, that it was impossible for him not to remark, that, in the last note of Mr. Chauvelin, the only question related to a communication which he desired Lord Grenville to make to the two Houses of Parliament, before they deliberated on a subject which Mr. C. appeared to believe they were about to discuss. His lordship reminded Mr. C. that, as Secretary of State to his Majesty, he could not receive any communication from a foreign Minister; but, in order to lay it before the King, and to receive his Majesty's commands thereupon, and that the deliberations of the two Houses of Parliament, as well as the communications which his

Majesty might be pleased to make to them, relative to the affairs of his kingdom, were objects absolutely foreign to all diplomatic correspondence, and upon which it was impossible for him to enter into any discussion whatever with the ministers of other courts.

This timely reproof, in all probability, prevented many similar attempts at interference in the internal concerns of this country, by Mr. Chauvelin, who seems to have been admirably formed for a revolutionary diplomatist. In his reply to Lord Grenville, he disclaimed all intention of departing from the established rules and forms of this kingdom, and declared his only wish to be, to render the intentions of the French nation as public as possible;—In other words, to appeal from the King to the people. No further notice, however, was taken, at present, of this extraordinary mode of proceeding.

On the 25th of May, the proclamation was taken into consideration by the House of Commons, when an address was proposed by the Master of the Rolls, expressive of the indignation of the House at the attempts which had been made to weaken, in the minds of his Majesty's subjects, the sentiments of obedience to the laws, and of attachment to the form of government, civil and religious, so happily

established within this realm. It further stated, and with great truth, that the advantages which, under the government of his Majesty, and his illustrious ancestors, had been derived from legal and well-regulated freedom, and the unexampled blessings actually enjoyed, afforded to his Majesty's subjects peculiar motives to reflect, with gratitude, on their present situation, and to beware of those delusive theories which were inconsistent with the relative duties of all civil society; and that it was the peculiar duty of every good citizen to discourage and counteract every attempt, direct and indirect, against public order and tranquillity. These sentiments, the Commons were confident, were the general sentiments of the nation, who must feel with them, that real liberty could only exist under the protection of law, and the authority of efficient and regular government: they had seen, by happy experience, that the mixed form of our legislature, comprehended and provided for the various interests of the community through all its several descriptions, and maintained and preserved those gradations of property and condition which furnished the great incentives to useful industry, and were equally essential to the vigour and exertion of every part, and to the stability and welfare of the whole; that

they, therefore, knew that the collective strength and prosperity of the empire, its wealth, its credit, and its commerce, as well as the only security for the persons, the property, and the liberties, of each individual, were essentially connected with the preservation of the established constitution.

These truths, so simply, yet so strongly expressed, and forming an admirable contrast to the metaphysical jargon of the legislative sages of revolutionary France, were followed by a solemn pledge of support to his Majesty, in all his efforts for *maintaining the laws and constitution of the country, against every attempt to violate or to subvert them. To this address* a long amendment was *proposed by Mr. Grey,* declaring, in substance, that while the Commons expressed a dutiful attachment to his Majesty's person and government, and held in abhorrence all wicked and seditious publications, they conceived the King's ministers to have been guilty of gross and criminal neglect, if they had suffered any writings, which were *proper* objects of prosecution, to circulate, for a length of time, without being noticed; and that, ever anxious to suppress riots and tumults, they regretted deeply the disturbances at Birmingham, in the preceding Summer, and suggested the expediency of bringing to punish-

ment the aiders and abettors of those scenes of violence and outrage.

It is worthy of observation, that the sincerity of that abhorrence of all seditious publications, which was expressed in this singular amendment, might be open to some suspicions, when it was followed by a reference to the riots at Birmingham without the smallest accompanying notice of the hand-bill which gave rise to them, and which was certainly one of the most wicked and seditious publications which the brain of treason had hitherto engendered.

In the course of the debate, which followed these motions, the opposition condemned the proclamation, in terms of pointed reprobation, as intended to create a schism in the Whig Party, upon the union of which, it was gravely contended, the maintenance of the constitution, in purity and perfection, essentially depended; as having a further object in view; to prevent all attempts to procure a reform in Parliament; to vilify the associations instituted for that purpose; to provoke, rather than to suppress, riots and tumults from which no danger was to be apprehended, unless, from such as occurred at Birmingham; and to convert magistrates into spies and informers. The very idea of such a proclamation issuing from the King of a free people, and countenancing such a system, was

declared to be alike singular and detestable. Mr. Grey indulged himself freely, in his usual strain of personal invective against Mr. Pitt, whose supreme delight, he affirmed, it was to see discord supersede harmony among those who opposed his measures, whose whole political life was a tissue of constant inconsistency, of assertion and retractation; who never proposed a measure without intending to delude his hearers, promising every thing, but performing nothing, and perpetually breaking his word with the public; who studied all the arts of captivating popularity without ever intending to deserve it, and who was a complete apostate from the very commencement of his political life; whose malignity sought its gratification in the separation of the dearest friends, and whose whole conduct was one uninterrupted, serious, and contemptuous disdain towards the rights of the people, and the privileges of the House of Commons.

This splenetic effusion of testy malevolence was treated with becoming contempt by Mr. Pitt, who coolly observed, that no invective should ever deter him from pursuing that line of conduct which he deemed most conducive to the public tranquillity, and to the preservation of constitutional freedom. In answer to the charges brought against the proclama-

tion, and its authors, the intention of creating divisions among their political adversaries was strongly disclaimed by the ministers; and the existing schism in the opposition was justly imputed to a real difference of opinion on points of primary importance. As Lord North, the Marquis of Titchfield, Mr. Windham, and Mr. Anstruther, had spoken in support of the address, the peevishness and petulance of Mr. Grey, and his colleagues, were naturally accounted for. But a conviction of the rectitude and utility of the proclamation, of its absolute necessity to the maintenance of order, and to the tranquillity of the state, was truly considered as the only motive which had induced the gentlemen in question to abandon those friends, on the present occasion, with whom they had acted so long and so consistently; a fair and honourable line of conduct, which afforded sufficient proof, that whatever might be the state of parties, the great and respectable body of the House of Commons would always give up private predilections for public security.

The Ministers declared, that they had not particularly in their view, when they framed the prosecution, the Society of Friends of the People, but the different seditious societies established in various parts of the realm;—

though that society would indeed be implicated, if they chose to connect themselves with other societies of such a description. The reason assigned for not prosecuting the first part of Paine's Rights of Man, was the idea, that a publication so bold, so profligate, and so absurd, could do but little mischief; but when clubs were formed for disseminating the flagitious principles which it contained, among the lower classes of people, considerable alarm was excited; and the appearance of the second part, more abandoned if possible than the first, had induced the government to resolve on its immediate prosecution. In reply to the absurd charge of converting magistrates into spies, the opposition were told, that the proclamation did no more than remind the magistrates of a duty which the laws compelled them to perform. Mr. Pitt, observing that Mr. Fox had rather ridiculed the idea of danger from the circulation of seditious doctrines, considered him, if not the declared advocate of such doctrines, in some degree, at least, a friend to them. But Mr. Fox answered, that he had no fears on the subject, because he knew that the good sense and constitutional spirit of the people would prove a sure protection against all rash and absurd theories; and he appealed, for the rectitude and purity of his political principles,

to the whole tenor of his past life.—The amendment was rejected, and the address carried without a division.

As it was intended by ministers to make this a joint proceeding of the two Houses, the same address was, on the 31st of May, proposed in the House of Lords, by the Marquis of Abercorn, who charged the Society of *Friends of the People* with having erected a standard to which the disaffected, of every denomination, might resort. Mr. Grey's amendment was moved by Lord Lauderdale, and supported by the Marquis of Lansdown. On this occasion, the Prince of Wales appeared in his place, as a Peer of the realm, and, feeling the importance of the subject, delivered his sentiments in favour of the address.—On such a subject, his Royal Highness said, he should be deficient in his duty, as a Member of Parliament, unmindful of the respect which he owed the constitution, and inattentive to the welfare, the peace, and the happiness of the people, if he did not state to the world his opinion on the present subject of deliberation. He was educated in the principles of the British Constitution, and should ever preserve its maxims; he should ever cherish a reverence for the constitutional liberties of the people; as, on those constitutional principles, uniformly

carried into practice, the happiness of these realms depended, he was determined, as far as his interest could have any force, to give them his firm and constant support. The question at issue was, in fact, whether the constitution was or was not to be maintained; whether the wild ideas of untried theory were to conquer the wholesome maxims of established practice; whether those laws, under which we had flourished for such a series of years, were to be subverted by a reform unsanctioned by the people. As a person nearly and dearly interested in the welfare, and, he should emphatically add, the happiness of the people, it would be treason to the principles of his own mind, if he did not come forward and declare his disapprobation of the seditious writings which had occasioned the motion before their Lordships. His interest was connected with the interests of the people; they were so inseparable, that unless both parties concurred, the happiness of neither could exist. On this great and solid basis he grounded his vote for joining in the address which approved the proclamation. His Royal Highness, in conclusion, observed, that he existed by the love, the friendship, and the benevolence, of the people, and he never would forsake their cause, so long as he lived. These sentiments did honour to the Prince, and the

seasonable declaration of them exhibited a favourable specimen of his judgment. The address was also supported by several noblemen, who had hitherto acted with the opposition.—Among these were the Duke of Portland, Earl Spencer, and the Lords Hay, Porchester, Rawdon, and Stormont. Lord Grenville declared, that the seditious societies, which had induced the proclamation, had not only disseminated the most mischievous doctrines against government, but had avowedly entered into a correspondence with foreign societies, for the worst of purposes; and had even commenced their treacherous designs, by dispersing inflammatory hand-bills in the army and navy, in the hope of exciting mutiny and disorder.—The amendment of Lord Lauderdale was negatived, and the address carried, without a division. It was made the joint address of both Houses, and, as such, was presented to his Majesty, by whom it was most graciously received.

The conduct of the Duke of Portland, and of the other noblemen, who had so long acted with Mr. Fox and his friends, in sacrificing private feelings to a sense of public duty, was most honourable, and, in the true sense of the word, *patriotic*. It was so considered by Mr. Pitt, who began to feel considerable alarm,

at the rapid progress which the revolutionary doctrines were now making in England, at the increasing number of societies, established for the avowed purpose of disseminating them, and at the active industry displayed, and bold language assumed, by the partisans, and the emissaries, of faction. Impressed with these sentiments, he ardently desired to unite all the talents and integrity of the empire, in support of the laws, and in defence of the constitution; and he resolved to take an early opportunity for the adoption of such measures as were best calculated for the accomplishment of this desirable end. Meanwhile the business of Parliament was approaching to an end.—The India budget, which was opened by Mr. Dundas, with his usual clearness and ability, on the 5th of June, and which occasioned but little discussion, was the last business which occupied the attention of the Lower House. There were some bills, however, still in their progress through the Upper House, and among those, two which afforded Lord Thurlow, the Chancellor, an opportunity for vilifying his colleagues in office, in a manner unprecedented in the history of Parliament.

Mr. Pitt's bill, for continuing the sinking fund, and for providing a new one with every future loan, was the first object of his Lordship's

attack.—He represented it as exhibiting a degree of presumption and arrogance, in dictating to future Parliaments, which he trusted the House would never countenance. It was nugatory and impracticable in his opinion; the inaptness of the project was equal to the vanity of the attempt; none but a novice, a sycophant, a mere reptile, as a Minister, would allow this act to prevent him from doing what the exigency of circumstances might require, according to his own judgment.—In the committee, so strenuous, determined, and violent, was the Chancellor's opposition, that the clauses passed only by the small majority of six.

Lord Thurlow next attacked a bill which had passed the Lower House, for encouraging the growth of timber in the New Forest.—As it was introduced late in the session, the period of its introduction was represented by his Lordship as highly indecent; and he objected to what he called the *supposed* principle of the bill, for he would not admit that it was founded on any *real* principle, as tending, *under false pretences*, to deprive the Crown of that landed property to which it was entitled by the constitutional law of the country. He maintained, that it was of consequence that the King should have an interest in the land of the kingdom. He allowed the imperfection of the forest laws,

but he insisted that the defects of this bill were infinitely more pernicious.—Not content with giving this decided opinion against the bill, which, as a Member of Parliament, he had an unquestionable right to give, but which, as a cabinet minister, it might have been expected that he would first give in the cabinet, he attacked the framers of it, his colleagues in office, in the most pointed and most unjustifiable manner. He openly charged them with having imposed upon their Sovereign, and did not scruple to assert, that, if the members of that House, who were the hereditary counsellors of the Crown, did not interfere, in opposition to those who had advised this measure, *all was over!*

Now, it is perfectly clear, that if the Lord Chancellor, who is the supposed keeper of the King's conscience, really entertained such an opinion of any of his Majesty's official advisers, and actually believed that they had been guilty of so gross a breach of *their* duty as to impose upon his Majesty, with a view of betraying him into a measure hostile to the rights and interests of his Crown, it was *his* bounden duty to denounce such delinquents to his Sovereign, and to call upon him to dismiss them from his councils. If the King had not chosen to follow his advice, and had, at the same time, not been able to convince his Lord-

ship of the fallacy of his own notions, it would then have become the Chancellor to resign the seals, and to oppose the ministers and their measures in Parliament.—But if, after a measure has been discussed in the cabinet, and a majority of the members have decided in its favour, it is to be afterwards opposed in Parliament by the minority, and its framers and supporters to be attacked and reviled, all that harmony and cordial co-operation which are essential to the good government of a kingdom, would be destroyed; all vigour in action would be checked, all energy in council palsied, and the public good materially injured.

The acrimony with which Lord Thurlow had attacked the ministers, rendered it necessary for Lord Grenville to rise in vindication of himself and his colleagues, in whose names, and on whose behalf, he utterly disclaimed all intention of deluding his Sovereign, on that or on any other occasion; and expressed the greatest reverence, affection, and gratitude, to his person, as well as constitutional solicitude for the maintenance of his just prerogatives. A majority of eighteen decided in favour of the bill; but it was afterwards given up, by the ministers, for that session.—On the 15th of June, the King in person prorogued his Parliament.

It was impossible, after the extraordinary

conduct of the Chancellor, that Mr. Pitt could continue to act with him.—He accordingly represented, with becoming respect, to his Majesty, the fatal consequences of such a schism in the cabinet, and the necessity under which he felt himself to request permission to retire from office, unless the seals were taken from Lord Thurlow.—The King admitted the justice of the representation, and the great seal was demanded of the Chancellor on the very day on which the prorogation of Parliament took place, when it was put into the custody of three commissioners, at the head of whom was Chief Baron Eyre.

Mr. Pitt was now, more than ever, anxious for a junction of parties, in order that the whole strength of the national councils might be directed to one object,—the security of the state against danger from abroad, and sedition at home. His anxiety was communicated to those noblemen and gentlemen of the opposition who had concurred in the measure of the proclamation; and they were given to understand, that if an union could be formed, on honourable principles, there would be no objection to include even Mr. Fox in the new arrangements. Mr. Burke was the medium through which these overtures were made; but they were rendered abortive by Mr. Fox, whose personal pique

against Mr. Pitt appears to have prevailed over every sentiment of patriotism, and over all considerations of public duty.—He refused to accede to the proposed union, unless Mr. Pitt would first relinquish the situation which he held, to be placed more on a level with himself in office, and the Duke of Portland, or some other neutral person, to be appointed to the treasury. It was not to be supposed that Mr. Pitt, enjoying, as he did, the confidence of his Sovereign, of the Parliament, and of the Country, would submit, merely to gratify the pride of Mr. Fox, to relinquish that situation which had enabled him to digest, to mature, to propose, and to carry into effect, those favourite and important operations of finance, and measures of revenue, from which he expected the most beneficial results to the state; and on the success of which he hoped to found an honourable fame. It was true that Mr. Fox had, in the beginning of 1784, when the country gentlemen, at the St. Alban's Tavern, had kindly undertaken to relieve the King from the trouble of appointing his own ministers, proposed the same condition to Mr. Pitt, as an *amende honorable*, for presuming to think himself the Minister of the Crown, and not the Minister of the House of Commons. But as, on that occasion, an appeal had been made in the constitutional way, from the House to their

constituents, and as the result had been decisive in favour of Mr. Pitt, it was natural to conclude, that that question, thus decided by a competent tribunal, was now at rest for ever. At all events, it must have been perfectly clear to Mr. Fox, that his political rival, so doubly fortified by the royal favour and by the popular voice, would never consent to abandon the vantage ground which he had gained, and to descend from the high eminence on which he stood, merely to acknowledge himself in the wrong, and his opponent in the right; and so to convert the signal defeat, which Mr. Fox had sustained, into a triumph. It is scarcely possible, therefore, to believe that Mr. Fox had any sincere wish for an union of parties; and it is highly probable that he proposed a condition which he knew would be rejected, in order to evade a proposal for the rejection of which he could assign no satisfactory reason to his honourable associates. It was not, then, without justice, that his claim of perfect equality was represented as a mere artifice, adopted to procure the gratification of a personal jealousy by the humiliation of the Minister, which jealousy, if it existed at all, could not fail to counteract all the advantages which it was hoped to derive from the projected coalition;—while Mr. Pitt's willingness to share with his opponents, on honourable

terms, that power of which he was in full and entire possession, exhibited an unequivocal proof of his sincerity, in preferring the interests of the country to any private ends of his own. Though the negotiation was, by this means, broken off; and though it was evident, from what had passed during its existence, that no rational hope could be entertained of a cordial union of parties; a vacant blue ribband was offered to the Duke of Portland, in the most delicate manner; so as to lay his Grace under no obligation to the Minister, by his acceptance of the proffered honour. The Duke, however, thought proper to decline it, though with the most respectful and dutiful acknowledgements, until he could with satisfaction to himself take a responsible part in the King's councils.

The dismission of Lord Thurlow was by no means calculated to weaken the administration; for though his lordship was, undoubtedly, possessed of strong talents, he was of a temper so untractable, that it was scarcely possible to preserve harmony in a cabinet, of which he was a member. He had a brain particularly fertile in objections, and barren of expedients; he perpetually started obstacles to measures proposed, but never suggested, either new measures less objectionable, or any means for the removal of the difficulties which he pointed out. He was

imperious, dictatorial, and arbitrary; but his character had more of mulish obstinacy than of manly firmness in it; and the pertinacious adherence to his own opinions, which he so frequently displayed, was less the result of any fixed principles, than the operation of a certain dogmatical vanity, acting upon a churlish temper, wholly unaccustomed to the salutary influence of a controlling judgment. Though his *professions* bespoke resolution, his *conduct* was neither decisive nor consistent. Of the contrast which they sometimes exhibited, indeed, his negotiations at Carlton House, and his speeches in the Senate, on the subject of the regency, afforded a signal and a memorable instance.—On the present occasion too, there was reason to believe, that his difference with the cabinet was far from being limited to the two bills which he chose to make the public ground of it in the House. For if the sentiments which he did not scruple, at a subsequent period, to avow, respecting the seditious societies in England, were the real sentiments of his mind, he must have thought the proclamation an unnecessary, and, consequently, an unwise and impolitic measure.* It was his

* I have myself heard his lordship, in private company, ridicule the idea of danger to be apprehended from the establishment of such societies, whose means of mischief he considered as too contemptible for notice. And when the

duty, therefore, openly to declare his sentiments, since he thought it necessary to declare any difference of opinion between himself and his colleagues, and to make that strong, prominent, and important measure, the ostensible ground of his opposition to those with whom he had continued to sit in the cabinet, as it ought to have been an efficient reason for his resignation.

On considering all the occurrences in the political world, during the present session, the schism in the opposition, arising from a radical difference on a point of primary importance, both as affecting our foreign relations, and our domestic arrangements, and every other transaction connected with that topic, it appears that the power and influence of Mr. Pitt had been rather confirmed than shaken, strengthened than diminished, by the mixed moderation and firmness of his conduct; and that he stood equally high in the confidence of the Sovereign and the esteem of the nation.

successful efforts of the revolutionary party in France, apparently still more inadequate to the accomplishment of the proposed end, were suggested to him, he refused to admit the validity of the reason, or to depart, in any degree, from his pre-conceived opinion.

CHAPTER XIX.

Unsettled state of the Continent—Affairs of Poland—Salutary changes in her Constitution—Patriotic conduct of the King, and of the first Orders of the State—Approved by Prussia and Austria—Condemned by Russia—Arrival of a French Envoy at Warsaw—Consequent Confusion—Change in the sentiments of Austria and Prussia—Cause of it—Unprincipled conduct of the Empress Catharine—Difference between the Polish and the French Revolutions—Falsehood of the Russian Declaration exposed—Confuted by the Poles—A Russian Army enters Poland—The new Constitution is destroyed—Murder of the King of Sweden—Affairs of France—Meeting of the new Assembly—Increased Influence of the Jacobins—Impolicy of the first Assembly—Its Consequence—Composition of the Legislative Assembly—Power of the Constitutionalists annihilated—The Members of the Assembly swear fidelity to the King and the Constitution—Insult the King and resolve to shew him no marks of Respect—The King's resolution scrupulously to observe and maintain the Constitution—His remarks respecting it—The Queen's sentiments congenial with those of the King—The King refuses his sanction to two Decrees, for declaring all Emigrants Traitors, and for robbing the Non-juring Priests of their Salaries—Seditious Addresses presented to the Assembly, by which they are encouraged—Massacres at St. Domingo—The Massacres of the Whites defended by *the Friends of the Blacks*—Massacres at Avignon defended by Bazire and by

a Calvinistic Minister — Warlike disposition of the Assembly—Their hostile language and aggressive conduct —Violent speech of Isnard—Address to the King—Anacharsis Clootz recommends a general revolution of the neighbouring States (including England) to the Assembly —Memorable Answer of the President – Brissot insists on the policy of War—Insulting Manifesto issued—Addresses of some seditious Dutchmen, and of certain obscure Englishmen, favourably received by the Assembly— Similar Address from Liegè and the Austrian Netherlands —The Assembly encourages Rebellion in those States— Prudent and pacific conduct of the German Princes— Brissot again insists on the necessity of War—Death of the Emperor Leopold—The Assembly compel the King to propose a Declaration of War against Austria, which they vote by *acclamation*—Object of the Brissotin Faction in promoting War—Difference between them and the immediate followers of Robespierre—They concur in their object, but differ as to the means of obtaining it—Annexation of Avignon and the Comtat to France—Commencement of Hostilities in Flanders—Cowardly flight of the French Troops from Tournay—They murder their General, Theobald Dillon—Acts of atrocious Barbarity—Flight of the French troops in the neighbourhood of Mons—Change of Ministers—Manifestoes of Austria and Prussia—Brissot writes a Libel on the King—The Ministers refuse to prosecute him—M. Bertrand resigns—Narbonne is dismissed—A Brissotin Ministry formed—Progress of Anarchy —Persecution of Non-juring Priests—Horrible acts of Barbarity—Influence of the Press in the destruction of the Monarchy—Treasonable Speech of Isnard in the Assembly —Remarks on it—Decree for suppressing the King's Guard —Impeachment of the Duke de Brissac—Treacherous conduct of the Ministers · Decrees for forming a Camp of 20,000 Jacobins—and for banishing the Non-juring Priests

—The King refuses to sanction them—Inconsistent conduct of Dumourier on this occasion—Addresses threatening the Life of the King—Well received by the Assembly—Insurrection of the 20th of June—The King's opinion of that Event—Expects to be murdered—Refuses to quit the Capital—Attempt to assassinate the Queen—The Assassin rescued—Atrocious conduct of the Federates—Fresh Plots—Addresses from the Sections demanding the Deposition of the King—Conspiracy of the 10th of August—The King and Queen made Prisoners—Committed to the Temple—Judicial Murders—Atrocious opinion of Helen Maria Williams—Inhuman massacre of the Priests, on the first days of September—A wretch murders his own Parents, and carries their heads in triumph to the Jacobin Club—Sketch of Military Affairs—The allied Armies enter France—Their dilatory movements—Crooked policy of the King of Prussia—Suspension of Hostilities—Treacherous conduct of the Prussian Monarch to the French Emigrants—Different accounts of the respective numbers of the hostile Armies—False assertions of General Arthur Dillon—Retreat of the Allies from the territory of France.

[1792.] A great part of the continent of Europe, during this period, exhibited a scene which could not fail to attract the attention, to interest the feelings, and to excite the apprehensions, of those nations which did not take an immediate part in it, but which must have perceived, that, in its proximate or remote consequences, it was calculated to affect them all. In Poland, a country always bordering on a state of anarchy, and subject to the undue influ-

ence of the neighbouring powers, the efforts of a patriot King, and of a nobility and clergy, prepared to make every sacrifice for the promotion of the public welfare, were rendered abortive, when exerted for the laudable end of meliorating the condition of every class of the people, by the unjust and unwarrantable interference of Prussia and Russia. The latter power, in particular, whose ambition carried her to the most unjustifiable lengths, assumed a tone of command, and a conduct correspondent therewith, utterly incompatible with the independence of the state to which it was addressed. The alterations which the Poles made, in the internal government of their country, affected only themselves, and were adopted with the free consent of all the parties who had authority to adopt them.—They were the result of no arbitrary assumption of power, either by the King or by any class of his subjects; but were the fruits of the combined and deliberative wisdom of the constitutional representatives of the nation; and were not, in any degree, calculated, either by their influence or example, to excite commotions in the neighbouring states, or to afford any reasonable ground of offence or uneasiness to their rulers.* There existed, therefore,

* This observation is, perhaps, liable to one exception;—for, in a part of the constitution, there was an indirect invitation

no pretext for interference, except what arose out of views too unjust to acknowledge, and out of designs too dishonourable to reveal.

The principal change thus effected in the constitution of Poland, was the substitution of an *hereditary* for an *elective* monarchy;—a change highly favourable to national independence, constitutional stability, and social order. The destined successor of Stanislaus was the Elector of Saxony, a prince to whom no rational objection could be raised by any one. The King communicated the result of this bloodless revolution to the Emperor Leopold, and to the King of Prussia, both of whom expressed their general approbation of the event, and their particular congratulations on the wise choice which had been made of a successor. The Empress of Russia, however, indignant at every attempt to remove the shackles which she had imposed on this devoted country, openly expressed her high

to the peasantry of surrounding states, to seek, in Poland, for that freedom which they were not suffered to enjoy in their own country.—It proclaimed "A perfect and entire liberty to all people, who may either be newly coming from whatever part of the world to settle, or who, having emigrated, shall return to their native country." But it is worthy of remark, that the Empress of Russia had issued a similar edict, in 1766; she, therefore, had no right to object to a measure of which she had furnished the example herself. Still the article was objectionable and ought to have been rescinded.

displeasure at the presumption of its King and its representatives, in their resolution to assert their own independence, to consult their own happiness, and to act for themselves. — The rebellious nobles of Poland, who would not submit to a curtailment of their own power for the general good, she assembled around her in the capital of her Empire.

Nothing could exceed the wisdom, temperance, and judgment, displayed by Stanislaus throughout the whole of these events.—He encouraged the timid, he restrained the violent, he was the first to make sacrifices, and the last to claim privileges or power. But the arrival of a minister plenipotentiary from France, a M. Descorches, who was lately the Marquis de Sainte-Croix, but who seemed to have lost his honour with his titles, and who had become a furious jacobin, gave courage to the few violent and factious men at Warsaw, who wished to avail themselves of the present disposition to change, in order totally to subvert the constitution, and to introduce a new order of things after the French model. Against these Stanislaus had set his face; but, having formed themselves into a club, and assumed the appellation of "The Friends of the Constitution of the third of May," 1791, Descorches paid his court to them, increased their rage for innovation, and stimulated them to proceed to extremities, that they might

rival France, in infamy, degradation, and wretchedness. The prudence of the King, however, defeated their efforts, in a great degree, though, through their influence, one measure was carried, which gave great disgust to the nobility; this was the sale of the starosties, or fiefs, of the Crown, by which the power, both of the Crown and of the aristocacy, was considerably abridged. The new constitution was confirmed by the Dictines, which assembled in the Spring of 1792, and the popular voice was decidedly in its favour.

Nothing, therefore, was wanting to insure its stability, but the support, or even acquiescence, of the neighbouring states. But, before the commencement of the year 1792, a material change had taken place in the situation of Europe, and in the sentiments of Austria and Prussia. The rapid progress of French principles had excited a well-founded alarm in the minds of all the continental powers. The Emperor of Germany, and the King of Prussia, were the first to express their apprehensions of the rising danger, and the Empress of Russia had lately warned her subjects, emphatically and successfully, against the fatal contagion. These apprehensions had led the two first of these powers to dread any, and every, change, in the constitutions

of adjoining states, to regard the cry of liberty as the watchword of insurrection; and, consequently, to extend their fears to the late revolution in Poland, which, till now, they had viewed with a favourable eye. The Imperial Catharine, who, in her late proclamation against French principles, had artfully asserted, that they "would soon ruin Poland," would have been equally hostile to the new Polish constitution, if the French revolution had never occurred. Every thing which tended to give stability and permanence to the government of that unhappy country, and, consequently, every thing which went to establish its perfect independence on foreign Potentates, was certain to incur the most marked opposition on the part of the Empress, because they were calculated to disappoint her ambitious hopes, and to frustrate her unprincipled plans of conquest and aggrandizement.—Her hatred of French principles was natural, but she afforded not the smallest proofs of its sincerity; for, while she anxiously stimulated other powers to take up arms against France, she never contributed, herself, a single man, or a single ruble to the support of that cause which she affected to have so much at heart.—But Catharine had too much sagacity not to perceive, that the new constitution of Poland differed, most essentially

and radically, from the revolution in France, in every one of its features,—in its object, its end, its means, and its principle.—Her dread, therefore, of the effects of French principles, in Poland, was assumed, for the purpose of giving a colour to the most unjust and tyrannical interference in the internal concerns of an independent state, which unprincipled despotism ever enforced or attempted. Not one of the reasons urged, and successfully urged, in justification of the interference of foreign powers, with the transactions of the French government, an interference justified by all the sound writers on the law of nations, and on the paramount principle of self-preservation, could, by the most forced construction, or the most ingenious sophistry, be made to apply to the temperate, quiet, wise, and just alteration which had taken place in the constitution of Poland. But Catharine's plans were suggested by her ambition, regulated by her interest, and executed by her power. — Her will was absolute.—— *Sic volo, sic jubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas,* was not her *motto,* but the *rule of her conduct,* and *the principle of her government.*

She had long resolved that Poland should not be free, should not be independent; and she now determined to destroy, by force, what, in vain, she assailed by argument. On the 18th

of May, her Envoy, at the Court of Poland, Mr. Von Bulgakow, delivered a declaration to the Diet, by order of his Sovereign, couched in the most insolent and most insulting terms. Catharine did not scruple to make the partial change in their own constitution, without consulting her pleasure, the subject of complaint and reproach to the Poles. The advocate for monarchy in France, she did not blush to avow herself the champion of republicanism in Poland;—an absolute sovereign herself; she did not hesitate to reprobate "the union of power in one single hand as utterly incompatible with republican principles." In possession of an hereditary throne, she dared to tax, as an *audacious violation* of the laws, the conversion of the elective throne of Poland, into an hereditary throne;—and, lastly, while she punished, with the most rigorous severity, every reflection of her subjects upon her own government, she openly encouraged the seditious and rebellious Poles, and appealed from the lawful rulers of the state to the people!—In short, a more flagrant, outrageous, and unprincipled interference with the internal polity of a foreign state, history does not exhibit.

In this declaration, too, which it is impossible to characterize in terms of adequate strength, she accused all those Poles who had

sworn obedience to the new constitution, and who formed, at least, nine-tenths of the whole population of the country, with perjury; and she expressed her resolution to send an army into Poland, for the purpose of restoring, by force, the ancient order of things. The King of Prussia, at the same time, determined to remain neuter, though in direct violation of an existing treaty with Poland, concluded in 1790; and the Emperor of Germany adopted the same line of conduct;—so that Catharine had now nothing to fear but from the unequal efforts of a people, whom she exerted every art to divide. Indeed, she had prudently forborne to publish this hostile paper, until she was apprized of the declaration of war, by the National Assembly of France, against Austria, which was made on the 20th of April, and reached Vienna on the 30th.

The Polish government had no difficulty in confuting the fallacies and the falsehoods which the Russian Empress had stooped to adopt in the declaration of her minister. — Their answer was firm, temperate, and dignified; and an animated address, from the King to his subjects, was published about the same time, which produced the desired effect.—But the ability to make the necessary preparations for opposing so powerful an enemy, was by no means equal to the public spirit which pre-

vailed. The Empress poured one formidable body of troops into the Ukraine, and another into Lithuania;—in neither place was there any force adequate to a successful resistance. The Poles, however, notwithstanding their inferiority, fought bravely and skilfully; but numbers soon prevailed over courage, and, in less than two months, the Russians, having advanced to within three days march of the Capital, compelled the King to save his Throne, by consenting to the abolition of the new constitution. This compulsory act took place on the 23d of July, when an armistice was immediately concluded, and the command of the Polish troops consigned to a Russian General.

During the exhibition of this disgraceful scene in Poland, Sweden had been the theatre of another exhibition, not less disgraceful, and still more atrocious. Gustavus, the heroic monarch of that country, who had taken a deep interest in the fate of the unhappy King of France, and who had it in contemplation to lead a body of six and thirty thousand Swedes and Russians into his territories, in order to co-operate with the allies, for restoring him to liberty, was assassinated, on the 16th of March, 1792, at a masquerade at the Opera-House, in Stockholm, by a person named Ankerstrom, who had formerly been an officer of the guards, and who was one of a band of conspirators

who had taken offence at some part of the public conduct of the King, and had long had this deed in contemplation. The King met his death with the firmness, resignation, and temper of a Christian.—With his dying breath, he pardoned the traitors who had deprived him of life, except the immediate perpetrator of the deed, who, on the representation of the destined regent, the Duke of Sudermania, was reserved as a victim to offended justice. This Prince, who possessed many great and heroic qualities, had rendered his country infinite service, by curtailing the power of a corrupt and turbulent nobility, by increasing the comforts of his people, and by shaking off the degrading yoke of dependence, in which the Russian Autocrate had long kept the Court and Cabinet of Stockholm. The tears of the virtuous and the good consecrated the memory of Gustavus, while it was further honoured by the loud exultations which the leaders of the French revolution manifested at his premature death.

After the dissolution of the National, or Constituent, Assembly of France, already noticed in a preceding Chapter, the first fruits of the new constitution, which was represented as pregnant with liberty and happiness to every class and distinction of people, were increased

persecution of the non-juring clergy, (or rather of the clergy who remained faithful to their oaths, true to their conscience, and firm to their duty;) and the complete triumph of the Jacobin faction. This triumph was evinced in their successful efforts to secure a decisive majority in the new assembly. At Paris, their success was complete. Brissot, one of their leaders, and Garan de Coulon, a lawyer, and his friend, were among the members returned. And although, by one of the last acts of the first assembly, all clubs were severely prohibited, it now became evident that France would, very soon, be subjected to the absolute dominion of the Jacobin Societies.

Among many other absurdities which the National Assembly had committed, was a resolution which they adopted, in order, no doubt, to afford the public a proof of the *humility* of men, who had for two years usurped the legislative and executive power, that none of their own body should be qualified to sit in the next assembly. This was a direct attack on that *Sovereignty of the People* which they had professed to make the corner-stone of their new constitutional fabric, since it deprived the people of their right to chuse such representatives as they most approved. Had this, however, been the only objection to it, the nation would

have had little cause for lamentation; but it had the fatal effect of excluding from the new legislative body, all those men who had most experience in the science of legislation, and many who were best qualified, and most willing, to preserve their country from the ruin which threatened it.

The composition of the new assembly was admirably calculated to forward the views of those, who, like Brissot, made no scruple to avow their wish for the total abolition of the Kingly power. It exhibited a motley mixture of briefless barristers, renegade priests, needy journalists, and seditious pamphleteers. It was any thing, in short, but a representation of property; for it has been asserted, with equal confidence and truth, that not forty of the members were in the possession of a clear annual income of one hundred pounds. The constitutionalists, who were a middle-party, between the Royalists and the Jacobins, a set of men who endeavoured to establish a regular government on the principles of anarchy, and who wished for *a King and no King*, or for a King in name but not in power, had sunk into general contempt, and in vain endeavoured to preserve the last relics of their influence, in the Club of the Feuillans.

It was clear that the popular talents of Bris-

sot, combining with his popular principles, would give him a decided superiority in the assembly. And as he had taken no pains to conceal his republican principles, his hatred of monarchy, and his warlike notions, it was not difficult to anticipate the line of policy, as well internal as external, which would be enforced and adopted. Having verified their powers, the members declared themselves a legislative National Assembly; they took the oath to live free or die, and solemnly swore "to maintain, to the utmost of their power, the constitution of the kingdom, decreed by the constituent National Assembly, during the years 1789, 1790, and 1791, to propose and assent to nothing in the course of that legislature, which might at all tend to infringe it, and to be, in every respect, faithful to the nation, the law, and the King." That it was never the intention of a great number of those who took this oath to observe it, and that they thus voluntarily perjured themselves, their subsequent conduct too plainly demonstrates. Their very first act displayed their determination to insult and degrade the King, who formed an essential part of the constitution, and to whom, also, they had sworn fidelity. Having deputed sixty of their members, with M. Ducastel at their head, to inform the King that the assembly was

opened, the next day was fixed by the keeper of the seals for receiving the deputation.---But, contrary to all established rules, Ducastel insisted on immediate admission, when he thus drily addressed his Sovereign:---" Sire, the National Legislative Assembly is definitively constituted; —it has deputed us to inform your Majesty of it." This laconic address was sufficiently republican, it would seem; yet did it not satisfy the assembly, who censured Ducastel for using the offensive terms,---*Sire* and *Majesty*. They next resolved to change the mode in which the King had been hitherto received by the assembly, when he had occasion to repair to it.--- A chair of state placed above that on which their President was seated, appeared too great a mark of distinction, to those Republicans, to be conferred on their Sovereign. Messrs. Couthon, Guadet, and Goupillau, a triumvirate of Jacobin lawyers, the two first of whom afterwards met the fate which they had long deserved, and, by an instance of retributive justice, not unfrequent in the course of this surprising revolution, perished on the very scaffold to which they had consigned the Monarch to whom they had sworn allegiance, were the leading orators on this occasion.— The first of these started the objection to the use of the words,---*Sire* and *Majesty;* and the

last thought, that it was beneath the dignity of the President to bow to the King. A decree was, in consequence, passed, the object of which was to render his Majesty's reception more conformable to the Republican notions of these legislative sages.—This decree, however, was reserved for further consideration, in consequence of the alarm which it excited, and the efforts of the least violent party in the assembly to oppose it. It is still worthy of notice, as a direct proof of the sentiments and principles, not only entertained, but avowed without scruple, at this early period of the legislative Assembly.

But the King had completely made up his mind as to the line of conduct which he would, steadily and uniformly, pursue. He was resolved, that no insults, however pointed, no treatment, however unworthy, should provoke him to the commission of any act which could, by malice itself, be construed into a breach of the constitution, which he had sworn to maintain. At the first interview which M. Bertrand de Moleville, who was now appointed Minister of the Marine, had with his Majesty, on the 1st of October, he pressed the King for an explanation of his sentiments on the new constitution, and the conduct which he expected his Ministers to observe in regard to it.

The King's answer was clear and positive, and such as left no doubt as to his real intentions.—"I am far," said the unhappy Monarch, "from regarding this constitution as a *chef-d'œuvre*.—I believe that there are great faults in it; and that if I had been allowed to state my observations upon it, some advantageous alterations might have been adopted. But of this there is no question at present; I have sworn to maintain it, such as it is, and I am determined, as I ought, to be strictly faithful to my oath; for it is my opinion, that an exact execution of the constitution is the best means of making it thoroughly known to the nation, who will then perceive the changes proper to be made.—I have not, and I cannot have, any other plan than this.—I certainly shall not recede from it; and I wish my ministers to conform to it."

To the inquiry whether the Queen's sentiments were the same as his Majesty's, the King answered, "Yes, perfectly.—She will tell you so herself." M. Bertrand then went to the Queen, who said, "The King has informed you of his intentions relative to the constitution. Don't you think that the only plan he has to follow is to adhere to the oath?" M. Bertrand having answered in the affirmative, her Majesty added, "Well, be assured that nothing shall make us alter our resolution.—

Allons, be of good courage, M. Bertrand, with a little patience, firmness, and consistency of conduct, I hope you will find that all is not yet lost." *

But whatever respect the Royal Family might be disposed to pay to the new constitution, the members of the Assembly were determined to render it perfectly subservient to their own ultimate views. Measure after measure was adopted, decree after decree was passed, the end and object of which were to insult the King, in the tenderest part, and to wound not only his *feelings* but his *conscience*. It was not his own *ministers*, however, who pointed the dart which inflicted this wound; but the determined enemies of the Altar and the Throne. The Assembly did not blush to call upon him to give his sanction to one decree for declaring his most loyal subjects, and even his own brothers, nephews, and cousins, *traitors*;---and to another which went to deprive the non-juring priests of the scanty pittance which the plunderers of the Church had assigned them, as stipendiaries of the state. But neither threats nor persuasions could induce Louis the Sixteenth to become a partner in acts of cruelty and injustice, from which his soul revolted. He availed himself of the right which

* Bertrand's Private Memoirs. Vol. II. p. 215—217.

the constitution had vested in him, and refused his sanction.

This firmness, on the part of the King, enraged the factious members of the assembly, and the ruffian leaders of the Parisian mob. Addresses were poured in from the turbulent inhabitants of the suburbs, couched in language the most seditious and treasonable, which were received by the assembly, not merely with silence, but with approbation. — "King, ministers, generals," said one of the orators, "be warned; --- you are placed between the altar and the scaffold; --- make your choice." The President of these legislators had the profligacy to praise "*the sublime patriotism*" of this preacher of assassination, and to exhort him to persevere in his sentiments!. Another orator observed, that "the sanction of a people is far superior to that of a King."—And the members themselves promulgated similar principles, though not precisely in the same language; and, perfectly regardless of their oath to preserve the constitution inviolate, they did not scruple to assert, that the King ought, in particular cases, to be deprived of his *veto!*

It required very little sagacity or foresight to perceive the obvious intention, as well as the direct tendency, of all these speeches and addresses.---The ruin of the monarchy was resolved on by the jacobin party, which was

now predominant, and which included, at this period, both Robespierre and Brissot, who, though hateful to each other, still had the same object in view, and co-operated for the production of the same end. The new principles of liberty which had been imported into Saint Domingo, and of which Brissot, the leader of the *Amis des Noirs*, was the grand patron, had already produced their natural effects.—Towards the close, of the year 1791, the assembly received accounts of the massacres of the Whites by the Blacks, which had begun by the assassination of those masters who had displayed the greatest kindness and humanity in the treatment of their slaves; and of the total desolation of a great part of that fruitful and valuable colony. Brissot undertook the defence of these patriots, who had acted on the pure principles of philosophy and liberty, which M. Bazire (another jacobin lawyer, and a tool of Robespierre, who, when he had no further occasion for his services, consigned him to the scaffold) asserted, were *affronted*, by the representations of a deputy from Saint Domingo, who described the enormities which had been committed in the island. Although excess of philanthropy had always been imputed to these *Friends of the Blacks*, Brissot, on the present occasion, displayed the most stoical insensibility to the suffer-

ings of the murdered and plundered *Whites*.—"Millions of Indians," exclaimed this philanthropist, "have perished on that land of blood!—At every step you crush under your feet the bones of those inhabitants whom nature gave to these countries, and *yet you shudder while you hear the deeds of their avengers*." He asserted that, in this contention of guilt, *the crimes of the white men were the most horrible!*

Another opportunity occurred, about the same time, for setting the philanthropy of M. Bazire in a strong point of view.—The horrible massacres at Avignon, under the direction of *Jourdan, the cut-throat*, had been forced on the attention of the assembly. A. M. Deleutre, who came from Avignon, to relate all the particulars of those horrible transactions to the Assembly, could scarcely obtain a hearing. Bazire, the advocate of philosophy and liberty, the strenuous *Ami des Noirs*, insulted and reviled him; and he was supported, in this laudable attempt, by M. de Lasource, a Calvinist minister, and a Brissotine, who, in the preceding discussion, had reprobated M. Blanchelande, the Governor of Saint Domingo, and the regular troops acting under him, in suppressing the rebellion of the Blacks, as *assassins and enemies of the constitution*; and who now insisted that Jourdan (who had been imprisoned

on a charge of murder, and was actually on his trial) should be liberated; and that a general amnesty should be extended to him, and to his accomplices.—And, to the eternal disgrace of the Assembly, a motion to that effect was carried.

Next to the ardent desire of insulting the King, and of annihilating royalty, the most prominent feature visible in the proceedings of the Assembly, was a marked hostility to foreign powers, and a declared wish for war. Towards the end of November, 1791, they took into consideration the collection of emigrants, in the neighbouring states of Germany, and called upon the king to insist on their immediate dispersion. But, although the King had even anticipated their wishes upon the subject, and had succeeded in his endeavours to obtain the object of their desires, yet, when he communicated his success to the Assembly, during their debates, the members, far from giving him credit for what he had done, still continued to censure "the apathy and torpor of the executive power." The fact was, that they did not want any step to be taken that was likely, in its consequences, to prevent a war; and, in a debate, on the 27th of November, M. Ruhl (a jacobin, who, in 1795, committed suicide, in order to escape execution) did not hesitate to

represent war as highly desirable to the French; and another jacobin, Isnard, expressed his conviction, that war "*would change the face of the world, and subvert the surrounding thrones.*"—This was precisely the object which Brissot, and all the jacobins, had in view; and all their efforts were now directed to its attainment. A short extract from the speech of this Isnard (who was a *perfumer*, at Draguignon, and who, after voting for the deposition and death of the King, and betraying, on all occasions, a most sanguinary disposition, joined the Girondists in their quarrel with the jacobins, and, unfortunately, escaped, by flight, the just reward of his crimes) will fully display the spirit which now prevailed in the Legislative Assembly.

"Let us elevate ourselves to the height of our mission; let us speak to the ministers, to the King, and to Europe, with that firmness which becomes us;—let us say to ministers, that they must take their choice between public gratitude and the vengeance of the laws, and that *by the word responsibility, we mean death.*—Let us say to the King, that it is his interest to defend the constitution; that he only reigns *by* the people, and for the people; that the nation is *his sovereign*, and that he is subject to the law. To Europe let us say, that the French people, if they draw the sword, will

throw away the scabbard; that they will only seek to crown it with the laurels of victory; and that if, in spite of their power and courage, they should fail in defending their liberty, their enemies shall only reign over dead bodies.—Let us likewise say to Europe, that if the cabinets engage Kings in a war against the people, *we will engage the people in a war against Kings.*—Let us say to her, that, from the moment when the armies of our enemies contend with our own, *the light of philosophy will strike their eyes, the people will embrace each other in the face of dethroned tyrants*, earth will be consoled, and Heaven appeased."

An address to the King, conformable to these sentiments, was unanimously voted, and his Majesty was pressed to insist, in more peremptory terms than had yet been employed, on the immediate dispersion of the emigrants, in Germany. He was likewise ordered (for the instructions were imperative) to collect troops, on the frontiers, to support his demands, and even to degrade himself by the use of a revolutionary threat, *to carry liberty*, that is to say, rebellion, into the heart of Germany, and to call upon Princes to calculate the consequence to be feared from the alarm of nations.

Soon after, the orator of the human race, Anacharsis Clootz, was again brought forward

on the revolutionary [illegible] furious rhapsody, equally wo[rth]y [illegible] and of his audience, he called on [illegible] to abandon the petty warfare in [illegible] ere about to engage, and enter in[to] [illegible] contest with existing thrones,—"[illegible] very where, or no where," was t[he] [illegible]ic advice of this consistent monit[or] [illegible]mended the diffusion of revoluti[onary] [illegible]es, as the most destructive instr[ument] [illegible] the French could wield. German[y] [illegible] England, were specifically in[clu]ded in [illegible]ast plan of emancipation, and he [consoled himself] [illegible]lf with the reflection, that, if th[e] [illegible]ld fail to accomplish their lauda[ble] [illegible]y would at least enjoy the supren[e] [illegible]of contemplating a general bank[ruptcy].

Far from disappr[oving] [illegible]e spirit or the letter of this ha[rangue] [illegible]resident of the Assembly assured [M. Cloots] That the Assembly received, wit[h] [illegible]ledgments, the homage of his opin[ion], whatever determination circums[tances] [illegible]nduce it to adopt, that *France he[art] [illegible] key of all Europe.*" And so m[uch] [illegible] with the feelings of the member[s] [illegible]ring to the vanity of the people, w[ho] [illegible]trous principles, and outrageous [illegible] both the orator's address, and th[e] [illegible]swer, were

ordered to be printed. Farther to evince the insincerity of their renunciation of all conquests, and the little inclination which they had to abide by the decree which proclaimed it, the Assembly did not scruple, in their King's presence, to declare, that the whole extent of country, including, of course, a considerable portion of territory belonging to foreign princes, from the Rhine to the Pyrenees, from the Alps to the ocean, should be protected by the superintendance of a good King, and by the rampart of a faithful people! It is of consequence to observe the exact conformity of this declaration, made so early as the 14th of December, 1791, with the pretensions so openly avowed, and so resolutely asserted, at a subsequent period, respecting the *natural boundaries* of France, the Rhine, the Pyrenees, the Alps, and the ocean!

The subject was renewed on the 29th of December, when Brissot and Condorçet both spoke in favour of war. "There must," said the former, "be war;—it is necessary for France,—for her honour, for her safety, *for the re-establishment of her finances*, and her *public credit*." It is perfectly clear that the object of such a war must be *conquest and plunder*, because, by no other means could war possibly conduce to the restoration of national prosperity and credit, which, in general, it has a natural tendency to impair. A mani-

they were favourably received by the president, who hailed them as *allies of the French people*, and even inserted their address in the minutes of the day.

An obscure society of Englishmen, who held their meetings at an alehouse in Frith Street, and who assumed to themselves the appellation of *the London Constitutional Whigs*, were received by the Assembly with equal distinction, when they generously devoted themselves, their lives, and their fortunes, to the defence of the French, in case they should be threatened by the arms of despotism. Not only was this address inserted in the minutes of the day, and formally communicated to the King, but the president was specially ordered to return a written answer, in which he informed the patriots of Frith Street, in the name, and with the approbation, of the Assembly, which obligingly styled them, "*The soundest part of the English nation,—the opposition of England,*—and even *England itself*;—that *the inviolable treaty* which virtue *alone* had negotiated, was simple as truth, eternal as reason."

A similar reception was afforded to a larger body of rebels from Liegè and the Austrian Netherlands, who were allowed to hold public meetings at Paris, and to pass the most violent resolutions against their own legitimate Sove-

reigns. These men published a declaration in the month of January, in which they bound themselves to shake off the intolerable yoke under which their countrymen groaned, and to expel the tyrants who oppressed them. And the patriots of Liegè afterwards denounced their Prince-Bishop as a traitor to his country, and as a perjured assassin, whom they swore to prosecute until they should bring him to justice for his crimes.

More marked indications of a hostile and aggressive spirit; of that determination, in short, "to brave Europe," which Brissot and his followers had early adopted, could not possibly be exhibited. But the conduct of the German princes was not at all calculated to afford the desired pretext for hostilities. The emigrants being dispersed, it became necessary to find another subject of complaint;—and the concert of princes against the liberties of France was fixed upon as the most likely to operate forcibly on the passions of the multitude. In vain, however, did M. de Noailles, the French ambassador at Vienna, goad Prince Kaunitz, in order to extort from him some confession or remark which might be seized upon as the ground of war.—That able, wary, and cautious statesman, was superior both in talents and integrity to the Gallic cabinet; and while he peremptorily dis-

claimed all hostile views, on the part of the Emperor, he depicted in strong, but true colours, the nefarious conduct of the French jacobins, in the Assembly, who had virtually declared war against all the powers of Europe. M. Delessart, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, read to the Assembly a note from the Emperor to the Elector of Treves, in proof of his Imperial Majesty's pacific intentions.—In this note, the Elector, who had claimed the protection of the chief of the empire against the threatened attack of his territory by France, was informed, that the promised protection was only conditional, and would not be granted, unless the Elector should have dispersed all the emigrants in his dominions, and have conformed himself, in every respect, to the laws of amity and good neighbourhood. But neither this unequivocal proof of a friendly disposition, nor a subsequent communication from Delessart, who read dispatches from the French Minister at Treves, stating the total dispersion of the emigrants in the Electorate, could deter Brissot, and his satellites, from urging the immediate adoption of hostile measures against the Emperor. In a speech of Brissot's at the latter end of January, 1792, he insisted on the necessity of a declaration of war: the reasons which he assigned, for imputing to the Emperor an enmity which he positively dis-

avowed, are curious, and truly worthy the philanthropic friend of the Blacks, who could coolly recommend, as a salutary expedient, to "set fire to the four corners of Europe."

"The nature of your enemy's hate," said Brissot, "must not be concealed if you wish to measure its extent. *Your Constitution is an eternal anathema against all absolute Thrones.* ALL KINGS *must hate your constitution: it brings them to trial; it pronounces their sentence.** It seems to say to each of them, 'to-morrow thou shalt be no more;' or, 'thou shalt be a King of the people's creation.' This truth has sunk deep into the heart of Leopold; he strives to ward off the fatal moment; and such is the secret of his hatred for the French nation, and the protection which he has granted to the Emigrants and to the Electors; and of the league of Kings whom he endeavours to excite against us. No;

* It is not incurious to observe, that, in one sentence, Brissot confines *the constitutional anathema* to *absolute* Monarchs, while, in the very next sentence, he extends it to *all Kings*. The fact is, the first *qualification* was only introduced for the purpose of obviating the charge of making his remark so general as to include the *French Throne*, and the *French King*; and, consequently, of representing the constitution as essentially hostile to *monarchy*, which in truth it was. In endeavouring to accuse the Emperor, Brissot completely justifies him, by acknowledging that his fears, lest French principles, and French intrigues, should endanger his throne, were perfectly just.

it is not the French nobility that he would re-establish; it is not the prerogative of a political phantom which he wishes to defend;—*Leopold fears for his throne. It is his throne that he endeavours to maintain, by a vain league against the torrent of the spirit of liberty.*"

Brissot deprecated all further explanation with the Emperor as perfectly unnecessary; and represented the revolution of the Netherlands as the consequence of the war; while Upper Austria presented an easy conquest to the French troops; while Spain was too much distressed to oppose their efforts, and while *the people of England would offer up prayers for the success of France, which they knew would be one day their own.* It was very easy to perceive, that while this spirit prevailed in the Assembly, in which, *in fact,* both the legislative and the executive power were vested, there was little prospect of any favourable issue to the efforts which the King might make for the preservation of peace. In a note from Prince Kaunitz, read by M. Delessart to the Assembly, in the month of February, were some very just remarks on the French jacobins, who were truly described as a perfidious sect, the enemies of the French King, and of the fundamental principles of the existing constitution, as well as the disturbers of peace and general repose. It was not to be sup-

posed that men, conscious of deserving these reproaches, would bear them with patience. Accordingly, the Members of the Assembly frequently interrupted the Minister with the strongest expressions of indignation and rage. One of them, Taillifer, a physician, exclaimed,—" This Emperor is a pleasant fellow,"—others proclaimed his Imperial Majesty to be a *Feuillant;* while others loudly vociferated—" What insolence!—War! War!

On the 28th of February, the French Ministers were apprized, by the Prussian Ambassador, that the invasion of the territory of the Emperor would be considered, by his master, as an attack on the German empire, which he should feel himself bound to oppose with all his forces.—So enraged was Brissot, at the temperate language, and circumspect conduct of Delessart, during this negotiation, that he had the profligacy to denounce him to the Assembly, and to make the very letter which that Assembly had loudly applauded the ground of his accusation.—The Minister was accordingly apprehended, and conveyed to Orleans, whence he was afterwards removed to Versailles, and murdered by the mob.*—Such was the justice,

* If any other proof than what the open declarations, and public conduct, of the jacobin faction in France, at this period,

such the humanity, of this boasted friend and advocate of the Blacks!

During these transactions the Emperor, Leopold, died almost suddenly,—but his death made not the smallest change in the sentiments or conduct of the Cabinet of Vienna. The French Ambassador, however, at the Austrian Court, assured the Ministers, that the successor of Leopold had adopted no measures but such as were purely defensive, while the King of Prussia had pressed the adoption of more hostile proceedings. Yet, without the smallest regard to these representations, the Assembly resolved on immediate war; and Dumouriez, the new

supply, of their own determination to begin the war, and of the perfectly pacific disposition of the neighbouring powers, were wanting, it would be found in the letter which the unfortunate victim of jacobinical rage, M. Delessart, wrote to his friend, Mr. Neckar, while he was in prison at Orleans. In that letter, he says, "I lament, as long as I live," (alluding to the defence of himself, which he was then employed in preparing) "that it could not appear at the present moment; for it would prove curious, not on account of what particularly relates to *me*, but in consequence of the manifestation of what has passed in foreign courts, *in consequence of the demonstration that they were unwilling to make war against us*; in consequence of THE UNANSWERABLE PROOF, that it was WE who PROVOKED THEM TO HOSTILITIES, who *began them*, and *who have set Europe against us*."

Reflections submitted to the French nation, on the intended process against Louis XVI. by Mr. Neckar.

Minister for foreign affairs, delivered in such a report to the King, as compelled his Majesty to go to the Assembly, on the 20th of April, and to propose a declaration of war. These legislators, who had publicly renounced all views of conquest, and who had proclaimed themselves the Heralds of Peace, and the Lovers of Humanity, displayed the most indecent joy on the occasion. When M. Mailhè, a lawyer, observed, that, by the declaration of war, *they were possibly about to decree the liberty of the whole world*; they burst forth into the loudest expressions of applause. War was immediately declared against the King of Hungary and Bohemia, but not a word was said of the King of Prussia, although they knew that his disposition and his views were more hostile than those of his ally; and although he had so recently informed the French Cabinet that any attack on the territories of Austria would be considered as an attack upon his own dominions, and, as such, resisted.

Dumouriez has assured the world, that nothing could exceed the joy with which this declaration of war was received by the people throughout France; and different motives have been assigned for the display of a spirit at once so aggressive and so unnatural. Brissot, and his associates, have, indeed, avowed *their*

motives for wishing for war.—On the 20th of October, 1791, Brissot himself told the Legislative Assembly, "You must not only defend yourselves. *you must begin the attack;*" and, on the 29th of December, he did not hesitate, unblushingly, to declare some, at least, of his motives,—"In short, *we must have gold to pay the troops,---France must have war to re-establish her finances and her credit;*"---motives for war, which, most certainly, no public character, in a civilized country, ever before dared to avow.—It was not, however, convenient, *as yet*, to state the *grand object* which he had in view, in forcing a declaration of war.—He reserved this last avowal for the period when his plan, for the destruction of the Monarchy, should have succeeded. When this period arrived, in September, 1792, he boldly declared, "BUT FOR THE WAR THE REVOLUTION OF THE TENTH OF AUGUST WOULD NEVER HAVE TAKEN PLACE; BUT FOR THE WAR FRANCE WOULD NEVER HAVE BEEN A REPUBLIC."* Hence it is proved, to demonstration, that the prevailing party in the Assembly, at the time wh n they solemnly swore to be faithful to the King, and to the new Constitution, were resolved to dethrone

* See Brissot's paper, Le Patriote Françoiss, of Samedi, 22d September, 1792.

the one and to destroy the other; and were, consequently, guilty of wilful and deliberate perjury.

It is to be observed, however, that another portion of Jacobins, with Robespierre at their head, (who was now public accuser to the tribunal of the metropolis) were not favourable to an immediate declaration of war, *because* they thought that it would retard, if not ultimately prevent, the destruction of the Monarchy. This notion of theirs was founded on the supposed inability of the French, in their present state, to cope with the whole force of the combined powers. But Brissot's sagacity was greater, though his prudence and decision were less, than those of his rival chief of the Jacobins.—The two men were intent on producing the same end, though they differed as to the means of promoting it. Brissot best appreciated the views and resources of foreign powers; Robespierre best knew how to govern *the* degraded people of France. They were both candidates for supreme power; and they hated each other, with most unchristian inveteracy.

Independently of the declaration of war, the French Cabinet had sufficiently shown the little regard which they paid to their formal renunciation of conquests, by their invasion of the rights and property of the German Princes

in Alsace and Lorraine, which had been guaranteed and secured by solemn treaties; and by first exciting a rebellion in the papal territory of Avignon and the adjacent country; and then annexing them to the dominions of France. It was determined, likewise, even thus early, to seize upon the King of Sardinia's territories, although the most scrupulous neutrality was observed by that Monarch, and although the French Envoy, at Turin, vouched for his pacific intentions to Dumouriez, now Minister for Foreign Affairs.

The first hostilities commenced in Flanders, where a body of three thousand men, under the command of Mr. Theobald Dillon, of the Irish brigades, were destined to make an attack upon Tournay, at the end of April. The troops, however, fled, in the most pusillanimous manner, when they came in sight of the enemy, who were greatly inferior in numbers, and, returning to Lisle with that rapidity for which Frenchmen are celebrated, sought to shield their own cowardice, under the pretext of treachery in their officers, and to display their courage, by the assassination of their general, whose body they committed to the flames, and then danced round it with the apish gestures, and malignant ferocity, of savages. These demons, in human shape, disgraced alike their profession

and their nature, by tearing the heart out of the mangled body, and carrying it to a female relative of the murdered general, who, although she had been only delivered of a child the morning before, had been confined, for six and thirty hours, in a dark dungeon, where the dreadful alternative was offered her, of being starved to death, or of satisfying her hunger by this horrid repast.*

The troops, under M. Biron, destined to make an attempt upon the important fortress of Mons, were equally cowardly, and equally unsuccessful. Attacked by an inferior force, commanded by the Austrian General, Beaulieu, they fled in all directions, disobeyed the orders of their commander, accused, like their brethren at Lisle, their officers of treachery, and disgracefully left their camp, baggage, and military chest, a prey to the victorious enemy.

* I have extracted this account from Rivington's Annual Register, for 1792, p. 404, where it is related, "on the authority of a gentleman, allied by blood to the General, who went to Lisle on purpose to investigate the particulars of the transaction."---The general accuracy of the historical account of French affairs, in that work, the great diligence and industry which have been evidently displayed by the writer, in the collection of facts and documents, and the spirit of truth, which pervades the whole, leave no doubt on my mind, as to the authenticity of this detail, although I have not met with it in any of the French publications, of this period, to which I have had occasion to refer.

Mr. de La Fayette, who was entrusted with an expedition against Namur, harassed by contradictory orders, and unprovided with necessaries, gave up the project, and remained in a state of inactivity on the German frontier. Thus vanished the sanguine hopes of the Jacobins, to overrun the Austrian low countries without difficulty, and without opposition; and to promote insurrections of their inhabitants, with a view to produce a jacobinical revolution.—The people, every where, either remained perfectly passive, or displayed hostility to the invading armies; with the exception of a few fugitive patriots from Liegè and Brabant, who took refuge with the patron of insurrection, La Fayette, and, under his auspices, formed themselves into a Belgic congress, dispersed the most indecent and libellous attacks on their Sovereigns, and, on the death of the Prince Bishop of Liegè, insulted his memory with the most unfeeling brutality.

These defeats, of course, excited great clamour at Paris, where they were ascribed to every cause but the right—the cowardice, and insubordination, of the troops. A change of Ministers was the consequence; a new plan of operations was settled; and a new commander appointed. Mareschal Luckner succeeded M. de Rochambeau; and speedily su-

duced the open and defenceless country between Lisle and Brussels. But he was soon driven back by the Austrians, and retreated hastily beyond the French frontier, after burning the suburbs of Courtray, and reducing the habitations of three hundred poor females to ashes, thus exemplifying, in an extraordinary manner, the revolutionary maxim of—war upon palaces, and protection to cottages!

Had Austria and Prussia been duly prepared for war; had they settled a plan of combined operations; had their armies been ready to enter the French territory at this period, there could be very little doubt of their success. But the new Emperor, Francis, and Frederick William, the Prussian Monarch, had been extremely averse from engaging in war, and, of course, extremely tardy in their preparations; so that they could not follow up the first advantages which the Austrian arms had obtained in the low countries. A great deal of time, now highly precious, was wasted in drawing up and publishing declarations, by both powers. In these, both the Emperor and the King of Prussia entered into a clear and forcible exposition of their motives, fully justified themselves from the charge of aggression, and proved, most satisfactorily, by arguments and facts, that the war had entirely been provoked by the

unjustifiable and hostile proceedings of the French Jacobins.

During these preparatory measures, the Anarchists of Paris were hastening, with rapidity, to the final accomplishment of their work.—The Press, that powerful instrument, infinitely more destructive than the sword, was employed, systematically and incessantly, for rendering both the Monarch and the Monarchy odious. And, in order to blunt its edge at least, if not to turn it against the enemies of the throne, it was deemed expedient, by the Ministers, to bribe some of its principal conductors. M. de Narbonne, one of the Cabinet, who was half a Constitutionalist, and half a Jacobin, or rather a man without any principle, but insufferably vain and egotistical, undertook to negotiate for the silence of Brissot and Condorçet. But while this matter was under consideration, the former of these incendiaries published, in his paper, a most atrocious libel upon the King. M. Bertrand de Moleville, then Minister of the Marine, pressed, in the council, the necessity of prosecuting the author. But his motion was overruled by the imbecility of M. de Narbonne, and his associates, who, even at this period, were either weak or wicked enough to think, or at least to say, that such libels were worthy only of being treated with

silent contempt. If men were really so weak as to entertain this belief, after the fatal effects which they had seen produced by the licentiousness of the Press, and the impunity which it was allowed to enjoy, within the two preceding years, they were wholly unfit to be trusted with the reins of government. If, on the other hand, they did not believe their own assertions, their wickedness was equal to that of the Jacobins, whose cause, whether intentionally or not, they effectually served. Soon after this, M. Bertrand resigned; M. de Narbonne was dismissed; a new ministry of Brissotins was appointed, who were speedily succeeded by others.

Anarchy, meanwhile, the natural offspring of Jacobinism, began to extend her gloomy reign over the fertile provinces of this devoted country. The non-juring priests were not only the objects of persecution themselves, but the cause of the persecution of others. Emigrations, for conscience sake, became frequent; children were forcibly taken from their parents to be baptized by a constitutional priest. Even the tomb afforded no refuge from the persecuting spirit of these Jacobinical fanatics, who dug up the cold remains of the dead to inter them afresh in unconsecrated ground, because, when living, they had heard mass from a non-juring

priest.—The Abbè Barruel, however, has recorded some instances of brutal outrage, and savage ferocity, exercised on the living, still more atrocious. In the diocese of Agen, the sister of the parish priest of St. Cecile, was beaten and ravished by a set of ruffians, who, in vain, attempted to make her violate her conscience, by repairing to a church at which a constitutional priest officiated, and she actually expired under the treatment which she experienced!* At Villeneuve, near Cordes, in Albigeois, a young couple having refused to be married by a priest of the same description, their door was forced open on the evening of the wedding; the husband made his escape; but the bride was subjected to the brutal lust of the ruffians, who, after they had satisfied their appetite, tore off the breasts of their wretched victim with their nails, and left her to expire in torments.—These are taken from among numerous instances of similar enormity; accompanied, however, by instances as striking of constancy and fidelity, on the part of those who adhered to the faith of their fathers, and who refused to obey the decrees of the Jacobins in violation of their own conscience.

* History of the clergy, during the French Revolution: by the Abbè Barruel. Vol. II. p. 43.

About this time, Dumouriez obtained from the Assembly £250,000 sterling, for secret services. Petion, the *virtuous* mayor of Paris, and the *sage* Roland, desired to have twelve hundred and fifty pounds a month allowed them, which they said should be employed to secure the public tranquillity. Dumouriez mentioned their request to the King, who told him, that he knew Petion to be his enemy, and that, if the money were given him, it would be appropriated to the purpose of distributing libels on the throne; but that if he (Dumouriez) thought it advisable to give it, he was at liberty to do so. The money was given, and the effect, predicted by the King, was immediately produced, by the establishment of a new paper, the *Sentinel*, conducted by *Louvet*, and by a woman who lived with him in a state of adultery, and whom he termed *Lodoiska*; in which the King was incessantly, and most grossly, libelled.

All this was intended to pave the way for the scenes which had been long projected, and for the performance of which the Jacobins now evinced extreme impatience. On the 15th of May, the perfumer, Isnard, who has been before noticed, proposed a most seditious remonstrance to the King, whom he had the audacity directly to accuse of having signed an order

for massacring the inhabitants of Paris in 1789; asserting, that the people had replaced him on the throne, when any other people would have deposed him, and when the English would have tried and condemned him for perjury; and impudently insinuating, that the Austrian generals had been informed of the plans of the French by his Majesty.

It is to be presumed that all the knowledge which this perfumer possessed of England, her history, and the disposition of her inhabitants, had been collected from the jacobin prints, or from the seditious addresses, which the factious clubs in this country had transmitted to the National and Legislative Assemblies.— It is certain, however, that, in no other public body, in the civilized world, would such a series of atrocious falsehoods, as this man had the presumption to utter in the speech in question, and in other speeches, delivered before the same assembly, have been suffered to pass without contradiction, or the speaker himself to escape without punishment.—He, though one of the many who had sworn obedience to the constitution, launched into a strain of violent invective against it. He condemned the first assembly for having established an order of things, which had left the will of one man exalted to a level with the will of all; which had trusted the

protection of liberty to the very hands which had kept the nation enslaved; and had put into them the two weapons most fatal to freedom,—*the sword that assasinates, and the gold that poisons.*—Here Mr. Isnard's zeal outstripped his judgment; and, like many of his worthy predecessors, he accused the King of the very crimes which had been committed by the jacobins themselves, and which, if the King had had recourse to them for self-preservation, would have completely marred all the efforts of the revolutionists, and have deprived Mr. Isnard himself of the opportunity of displaying his oratorical talents, beyond the precincts of his own shop. It was, indeed, the *sword of the assassin* that wrested the King from the palace of his ancestors,—that levelled with the dust the residences of the nobles, and multitudes of the nobility themselves,—that left the venerable ministers of religion, and their faithful followers, weltering in their blood, the expiring victims of conscience, or else drove them from their paternal homes, to linger out a miserable existence in a foreign land!—It was the *sword of the assassin*, in short, that, drenched in the blood of virtue, of integrity, of innocence, of royalty, and religion, converted France into a vast *aceldama*; destroyed every vestige of freedom; made her the undivided seat of trea-

son and of vice; and rendered her, at once, the dread, the abhorrence, and the scourge of surrounding nations. Had the unhappy, the feeble, the irresolute, Louis, only wielded, not the *sword of the assassin*, but the *sword of justice*, the loud voice of rebellion had been soon silenced, and the turbulent traitors of Paris had long since met the due reward of their nameless and numberless crimes. It was, indeed, the *gold* which poisons the mind, and corrupts the heart, of man, that had set that sword in motion by which freedom was destroyed; and that, at the very time when Isnard spoke, was employed by the traitors, Petion, Roland, and their sanguinary associates, in preparing further scenes of blood, and in securing the further triumph of treason and murder.—But it was blood for which Isnard thirsted, and his thirst of which he did not blush to acknowledge to the assembly!

After indulging himself in the most virulent abuse of the King, the priests, the nobles, and the rich, his hatred of whom might be, very naturally, accounted for, he proceeded to contrast the objects of his attack with those of his admiration and praise; with those whose cold reason, and inexorable policy, he said, were deaf to the promises of prostrate tyrants, and insensible to the call of self-interest, because

they knew that the freedom of a day always cost too much, but that durable freedom could not be too dearly purchased; and that *slight bleedings were not perceived in the body politic; that they were nothing when the public safety was at stake!* This strain of horrible declamation the cold-blooded assassin was allowed to pursue, for a considerable length of time, without interruption. He concluded with moving his remonstrance, "as a serious and definitive explanation with the King; the *ultimatum* of the sovereign will of the people, which should thoroughly impress the latter with a sense of their own dignity, and the former with a conviction of his nullity." But the Assembly were not yet ripe for the open avowal of such designs, and, notwithstanding the indecent plaudits and acclamations of the mob in the gallery, they passed to the order of the day.

The public mind having been prepared by this discussion, and by various others, for the destruction of Royalty, the Brissotins deemed it necessary, as a preliminary measure, to remove the King's guard, who were supposed to be attached to him, and who were commanded by the Duke de Brissac, from about his person. The resolution being adopted, a pretext was easily found for submitting the plan to the Assembly. These guards were described as

being infected with counter-revolutionary principles, and as having concealed a white flag, in a cellar, for the purpose of being displayed on some future occasion. On a charge thus vague and ridiculous did these *enemies of despotism* dare to order the Duke de Brissac to be arrested. — And that virtuous nobleman was accordingly apprehended, and conducted to the prison at Orleans, whence he was afterwards conveyed to Marseilles, and there murdered.— At the same time, and on the same pretext, the Assembly passed a decree for disbanding the guards.*

The King, who was fully aware of the consequence of giving his assent to this decree, announced to his Ministers his intention of refusing it. But the traitors, by whom he was surrounded, not only refused to countersign his letter to the Assembly, but even to attend him, when he proposed to repair thither, for the purpose of explaining the motives of his refusal. They were even base enough to tell him, that his refusal would be followed by the immediate massacre of his guards, and of every individual in the palace.†—And, by this infamous conduct, they induced the unhappy and forsaken

* Bertrand's Private Memoirs. Vol. II. p. 252.

† Idem. Ibid. p. 254.

Monarch to give, as it were, his sanction to his own deposition.

Having, by these nefarious means, disbanded the only troops on whose sources the Monarch could place the smallest reliance, the next step of the Jacobins was to collect an army, composed of men, long trained to blood, and prepared to execute their worst commands. The *sic volo, sic jubeo* of this Assembly, who had usurped the supreme power of the State, was amply sufficient for this, as for every other, purpose. A *decree* passed, at the beginning of June, for forming a camp of 20,000 Jacobin volunteers, from every part of the kingdom, being composed of five men from each canton, under the very walls of the capital, on the pretence of celebrating the anniversary of the federation. The measure was, indeed, proposed by a creature of Brissot's, whom the King had been compelled to admit into the Cabinet; but Mr. Servan (the Minister in question) did not even think it necessary to preserve the appearance of decency so far as to obtain an order from his captive master, or to communicate his intentions to his colleagues.—The plan had, nevertheless, been previously settled, discussed, and determined, at the Jacobin club. — "This measure," says a French historian, "was dreadful from its consequences.

The influence of the affiliated clubs fixed the men who were to be chosen in every canton, and, when united, they composed an armed force, at the devotion of those whose projects now began to be developed."*

About the same time, the Assembly passed another decree, for the banishment of all the non-juring priests. These decrees the King resolved not to sanction; and Dumouriez, with two other members of the Cabinet, Lacoste and Duranthon, seconded his resolution, and encouraged him to dismiss Roland, Claviere, and Servan, from his councils. This was accordingly done; but such were the weakness and inconsistency of Dumouriez, that, after these men were dismissed, he did not blush to urge the King to give his sanction to those very decrees which had been the ground of their dismission, and to declare that, if his Majesty would not sanction them, he must resign his situation. The King remonstrated against this indecent proposal, but in vain; Dumouriez, afraid of losing his popularity, and, perhaps, of falling a victim to the Jacobins, persisted, and his resignation was accepted.

* Histoire de France depuis la revolution de 1789, par le Citazen F. E. Toulongeon. Tome II. p. 141.

The disposition of the national guards of Paris, at this time, was favourable to the King, and to the existing constitution; but the superior vigilance, zeal, activity, and resolution, of the united jacobins, under Brissot and Robespierre, overpowered their feeble opposition, and bore down all before them. The long-projected insurrection of the 20th of June took place.—On the morning of that day the Assembly were early apprized that the populace were in arms; and soon after the ruffians of the suburb of St. Anthony, with the brewer, Santerre, at their head, marched through the hall in which these legislators were sitting.—The banners of assassination floated in their ranks; "*Tremble tyrant, thy hour is come,*" was the murderous threat displayed on one of their scrolls; and a reeking heart, stuck on a pike, inscribed "*The heart of an aristocrat,*" afforded a convincing proof of the disposition to carry such a threat into execution. These assassins were received (will civilized Europe credit the fact?) by the Assembly with applause, and the President even degraded himself so low as to compliment their sanguinary orator.

From the Assembly they proceeded to the palace, into the gardens of which they dragged their cannon, threatening to fire in case of resistance. These ferocious banditti attacked the

residence of their benevolent Sovereign, and broke open the doors of its various apartments, with hatchets and other instruments.—The King then came forward, accompanied by the Princess Elizabeth, who was mistaken by the rabble for the Queen; a mistake which, from the most humane motives, that virtuous lady encouraged. A fellow, armed with the blade of a sword, fastened to the end of a stick, no sooner saw the King than he put himself in a posture of attack, and would, probably, have completed the bloody work which he was hired to perpetrate, if he had not been prevented by the bayonets of the grenadiers. Indeed, there could be no doubt, from the threats and gestures of many of the mob, that it was intended to murder both the King and the Queen. Legendre, the butcher, addressed, in a tone of insolence and insult, the unhappy Monarch, who, for several hours was destined to hear the language of reproach, as cowardly in those who uttered it, as unmerited by him to whom it was addressed. The Assembly made no effort to afford relief to the King, or to induce the mob to depart: they sent, indeed, a deputation to the palace, when it was too late to produce any good effect; and it was treated by the rabble with the contempt which it deserved, and which it probably hoped to experience.—At length, however, M. Petion,

the factious mayor, appeared, and, by flattering the people, whose magistrate he called himself, and by commending that conduct which it was his duty to repress or to punish, he secured the only applause of which he was worthy, and incurred the only benediction he could hope to obtain. The populace retired with him.

The day after this disgraceful scene, Mr. Bertrand de Moleville had an interesting conversation with the King, who expressed his conviction that it was resolved to murder him,—that, sooner or later, such would be his fate;—and that his only wish, if such an event were to take place, was, that it might be the act of individuals, and not of the nation.* His Majesty, however, rejected the plan which Mr. Bertrand proposed for leaving the capital and retiring to Fontainbleau.

All the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly now clearly demonstrated the views by which the majority of them were actuated. The most violent motions were daily made, especially by the Brissotins, and the most unconstitutional decrees were passed; while fresh injuries, and fresh insults, were incessantly heaped upon the devoted head of the hapless King. Yet, in the midst of these palpable breaches of duty, of these flagrant

* Bertrand's Private Memoirs, Vol. II. p. 297, 298.

violations of the constitution, a scene occurred, unparalleled in the annals of human inconsistency. On the 7th of July, M. Lamourette, the new bishop of Lyons, truly observed, that the cause of the evil which afflicted the state was the disastrous divisions of the Assembly.—One side charged the other with the seditious design of overthrowing the monarchy, while the latter accused their opponents of wishing to introduce an arbitrary government. "Let us, then," said he, amidst a general tumult of applause, "with one unanimous and *irrevocable* oath, let us blast for ever the project both of a republic and of two chambers. I move that the president shall put the question for all to stand up who abjure and execrate alike, a republic and two chambers."—Strange to say, every member of the Assembly rose at the same instant, and solemnly swore to suffer no change whatever to be made in the existing constitution!* Yet,

* At the close of this singular scene, a deputation of twenty-four members was dispatched to the King to inform him of the event. His Majesty immediately repaired to the Assembly to which he expressed his extreme satisfaction, and by which he was received with the loudest applause. The galleries even joined in their expressions of joy on the occasion, and the president made a suitable answer to the King, who retired amidst acclamations, to which, of late, he had been little accustomed, and which, alas! he was never more destined to experience.

after an interval of two days only, did Brissot, the factious hypocrite, the perjured rebel, Brissot, deliver a laboured harangue on the state of the nation, replete with the most unconstitutional principles, and with the most treasonable sentiments. He did not blush to arraign the Assembly for their recent act, to hold up the King as a *criminal*, and, in pretty direct terms, to call for his deposition! Such was the respect which this philanthropic reformer of the French monarchy paid to the solemn obligation of an oath!

On the evening of the 14th of July, an attempt was made to assassinate the Queen, by a grenadier of the battalion of national guards, which was commanded by Santerre, the brewer, at whose instigation he undertook to commit this deed of blood.—Fortunately, the project was timely discovered, and the murderer was, in consequence, apprehended in the palace, when a cutlass was found concealed in the lining of his coat;* but he was rescued the next morning as he was about to be taken before a magistrate.

The ceremony of the federation was now renewed, and the *federates*, who had come to Paris to attend it, still loitered in the capital, and made no secret of their intentions not to

* Bertrand's Private Memoirs, Vol. II. p. 344, 345.

depart until they had expelled the King from the throne.* These were the chosen instruments of murder whom the jacobins had trained to their purpose; and the Assembly not merely connived at, but encouraged, the acts of outrage which they daily committed. The 29th of July was the day first fixed on for the intended insurrection, when the palace was to be again attacked, and the persons of the King and Queen seized, and confined in the Castle of Vincennes. Petion, the mayor, was privy to the whole scheme, and knowing, from his correspondence, that every thing was not prepared for the projected attack, he derived some credit with the court, who knew not his motives, for his successful efforts to stop the progress of some of the rebellious hordes, who, ignorant of the subsisting impediments, had put themselves in motion on the appointed morning.

On the third of August, Petion presented a petition to the Assembly, from the different sections of Paris, calmly demanding the deposition of the King. But, after some delay, it was referred to the consideration of a committee, whose report was not received before the fatal tenth of August.—The events of that day, rendered for ever infamous in the sangui-

* Compte rendu de Jerome Petion.

nary annals of revolutionary France, are well known. The project of the regicides, brought to maturity, was carried into effect; the Royal Palace was stormed, its faithful defenders were butchered, the King and Queen were made captives, and treason and murder reigned triumphant and uncontrolled. The Legislative Assembly, to which the Sovereigns of France fled for refuge and protection, were active supporters of the rebellion, assisted in delivering the innocent to be murdered by the mob, suspended the functions of royalty, vested the supreme power in an executive council, and consigned the King and Queen to the custody of the municipality, by whom they were committed to the Prison of the Temple;—thus completely subverting the whole of that constitution which they had, so recently, sworn to support.

The interval which occurred between this event, and the final dissolution of the Legislative Assembly, was marked by more crimes than had ever before been crowded into the same period of time. While the Brissotins began to tremble for the consequences of their own enormities, the other Jacobins felt their power, and resolved to exercise it. False charges, supported by false testimony, were preferred against all who were attached to the King and

the Monarchy, and judicial murders, daily committed, spread terror through the capital.—But even the red arm of the law moved not with sufficient rapidity to satisfy the impatient vengeance of the triumphant jacobins. Threats, in the form of petitions, were made to break open the prisons, and to glut their insatiate souls with blood. Even cold-blooded philosophers, and female casuists, were not wanting, to praise and to justify this atrocious plan. Mr. Petion, the worthy head of the Parisian municipality, observed, that "justice was slow to pronounce on the fate of the prisoners;" and a flippant writer of our own country, who had repaired to France to contemplate the charms, and the virtues, of political regeneration, coolly remarked, that "the tribunals, overloaded with business, and *hampered by the common forms of justice, too slow for a period of revolution*, made almost no perceptible progress in bringing the *guilty* to condemnation."* In pursuance of the murderous principles, naturally flowing from this new morality, the ruffians proceeded to execute summary justice on the second of September, when, and on the following day, the prisons were forced open, an indiscriminate massacre of its wretched inhabitants took place,

* Miss Williams's Letters from France, Vol. IV. p. 192.

priests, venerable from their age, and still more from their virtues, were inhumanly butchered in crowds, and the blood of innocence flowed in torrents around. The whole number murdered, on this occasion, as well in the various prisons, as in the streets of the capital, did not fall short of seven thousand persons. Many of these murders were attended with circumstances of peculiar cruelty. The Abbè Barruel, in his history of the sufferings of the French clergy,* asserts, on authority which he deems indisputable, that, at the Place Dauphine, men, women, and children, were thrown into a large fire, which had been kindled for the purpose, and their bodies consumed to ashes, while the cries of the suffering victims were deadened by the shouts of the barbarians dancing round the flames.

Nor was this systematic massacre confined to the capital. The dogs of slaughter were let loose in the provinces.—At Versailles, at Rheims, at Lyons, and at Meaux, numbers fell by various instruments of destruction.—At the first of those places, the state prisoners, who had been forcibly conveyed thither from Orleans, in direct contradiction to an order of the Legislative Assembly, were murdered by a body of *thirty* assassins, in the presence

* Part. III. p. 150.

of *fifteen hundred* soldiers, who had been sent to protect them. Here fell M. Delessart, the Duke de Brissac, M. D'Abancour, the Bishop of Mendes, and several other persons of distinction.

During the prevalence of this bloody fanaticism, a monster in human shape, whose name was Philippe, went, one evening, to the Jacobin club, with a trunk, which, after a suitable harangue on the duties of a patriot, he opened, and, exhibiting two bleeding heads, observed, they were the heads of his own parents, whom he had murdered for attending mass celebrated by a non-juring priest. — The horrible intelligence was received with applause by his admiring audience.

While the advocates of rebellion had thus successfully asserted their claims, and triumphed over the friends of their King and of their country, the allied powers of Austria and Prussia had, after much deliberation, and many changes in their projected plan of operations, marched their armies into the French territory. Their united force, which has been estimated variously, by the writers of the different countries, from eighty to one hundred and thirty-eight thousand men,* entered France, in two columns,

* Citizen Toulongeon is the only historian who has made

under the command of the Duke of Brunswick and General Clerfait; intending to pass through the forest of Argonne into Champagne, as the nearest road to Paris. It would be foreign from the purpose of this history to enter into a detail of military operations in which the troops of Great Britain took no part. It will be sufficient, therefore, to observe, that after the most unaccountable neglect to secure the passes of the forest, which might easily have been done without difficulty and without loss, the allies allowed Dumouriez, who now commanded the French, with an army little exceeding one-fourth of their own numbers, to seize two of the most important, and, by so doing, to arrest their progress, and to gain time for reinforcements from different quarters to join him. The delay, too, thus occasioned, produced other inconveniences; it afforded an opportunity for small detachments of the French, scattered on the rear of the allies, to intercept their convoys. Hence a want of provision was experienced in their camp, while

the allied armies amount to so large a number. But not one of the French writers is to be credited, in his details of actions, between his own countrymen and the troops of any foreign power. On comparing the various accounts, it seems most probable that the allied armies did not fall short of 75,000 men, and did not exceed 85,000.

the soldiers, partly, perhaps, from hunger, devoured, with avidity, the various fruits which the country presented; which produced that dreadful disorder, the flux, by which thousands are said to have perished in a short time.

It is to be observed, that the King of Prussia constantly accompanied his own army, which, in fact, he may be said to have commanded; for no operation of importance was undertaken without his previous approbation; and in some cases, on which the ultimate success of the expedition essentially depended, he opposed the plans suggested by the Duke of Brunswick. The Duke wished to reduce the town of Sedan, before they advanced further, and not to move forward without having secured themselves against the danger resulting from leaving behind them several strong fortresses in possession of the enemy. Had this wise plan been followed, a communication would have been preserved with Germany, and supplies easily received.—And, had the reduction of these places occupied any considerable portion of time, an event not to be expected in their actual situation, the allies might have then established their winter quarters in France, and maintained a rallying point, to which the enemies of the new order of things might have repaired. But the Prussian Monarch

seems to have been led, perhaps, by the too sanguine expectations of the Emigrants, to entertain the monstrous notion of carrying a whole nation by a coup-de-main. It does not appear to have occurred to him, that it was necessary first to gain a decisive victory, to disperse the French army, and to assert his own superiority in a manner so signal as to admit of no doubt, before the Royalists, who still remained in France, could be expected to join his standard, or even to avow themselves.—And, being disappointed in hopes which common sense would have rejected, regardless alike of his own honour, of the interests of his allies, and of the safety of Europe, he resolved to retrace his steps, and to avail himself of the first favourable opportunity, for not only evacuating the French territory, but for basely deserting the cause which he had so eagerly embraced.

On any other supposition it is impossible to account for the conduct of his Prussian Majesty. Agreeably to these intentions, on the twenty-second of September, after having compelled Dumouriez to evacuate the important pass of Grandpré, and after having driven Kellermann from the heights of Valmy, the Duke of Brunswick was ordered to propose a suspension of hostilities, in front of the respec-

tive camps, with a view to open a communication, for the purpose of carrying the King's intentions into effect. The *pretext* for this proposed suspension, was the establishment of a cartel, for the exchange of prisoners, which, in fact, was settled; but in a manner that reflected indelible disgrace on the King of Prussia. At the conference which took place, on this occasion, between the Duke of Brunswick and the French Colonel, Thouvenot, the former required that the emigrant prisoners should be included in the cartel, when the latter observed, "that one nation could only treat with another, and not *with rebels* to the laws of their country." The Duke is then stated to have asked, what would become of their prisoners? to which Thouvenot answered, that they must doubtless expect to be subjected to all the severity of the laws, and "possibly, according to circumstances, they might expect to receive the indulgence and generosity of such a magnanimous nation as the French republic." The Duke of Brunswick insisted no farther, and the cartel was settled, to the exclusion of the emigrants.* Passing over the

* *Resultat de la conférence qui a eu lieu entre M. M. le duc de Brunswick, le comte de Luchesini, ministre de sa Majesté le Roi de Prusse, et le lieutenant-colonel.--Adjutant-gene-*

republican flight of Mr. Thouvenot, who must have known that he and his associates were the only rebels to the laws, since they had concurred in the overthrow of the monarchial constitution, which they had sworn to maintain, it cannot escape observation, that the King of Prussia's conduct, in thus abandoning the emigrants, with whom he had made common cause, was most treacherous and base. In the several conferences which took place, between the Republican and the Prussian generals, as detailed and certified by the former, the latter are made to play a ridiculous and contemptible part. Without, however, stopping to examine the authenticity of these accounts, it is sufficient to state, that the negotiations were continued for several days. And, though hostilities were partially renewed on the 30th of September, there is reason to believe that a good under-

ral Thouvenot, chargé de l'échange des Prisonniers de g[illegible] entre les armées combinées et francaises. It is to be o[illegible] that Luchesini was not present at the beginning of [illegible] rence, when the proposal respecting the emigr[illegible] have been made; and that the account of [illegible] the authority of Thouvenot, it ought, [illegible] with some degree of caution. It [illegible] fact, however, that the emigrants we[illegible] cartel, and that they were, most un[illegible] he rage of their merciless persecutors.

standing had been established between the hostile leaders.—Certain it is, that the allies were suffered to retreat without molestation, the places which they had taken were surrendered without difficulty, and, by the end of October, they finally evacuated the French territory.

The accounts of the respective numbers of the hostile armies, at the period of this retreat, vary extremely.—Toulongeon, who has recently written a history of France, since the revolution, estimates the allied force, after all its losses, at 80,000 men; and, as he makes it amount, on its entrance into France, to 138,000, he raises their loss to 58,000. On the other hand, its original amount is stated at 80,000, and its loss, by the sword and by disease, at about one-third of the whole, which would reduce it, at the time of its retrograde movement, to about 54,000. Again, the same historian rates the French army, at this last period, at 60,000 men; whereas Carra, one of the commissioners from the convention to the army, makes it amount to 120,000.

The truth lies probably between the two extremes: but it appears sufficiently clear, amidst these contradictions, that the force of the allies was at first, sufficiently formidable to accomplish the original object of marching to Paris, had it been directed with prudence and

skill, and had not its operations been clogged by the wavering and timid policy of the Prussian Monarch. It is equally clear, on the other hand, that, at the end of September, its numbers had been sufficiently diminished, and those of the French sufficiently increased, to render any attempt to penetrate further into France extremely imprudent, and to expose the allied army, in its retreat, to considerable danger. It is thence to be inferred, and, indeed, the operations of the French, during the month of October, sufficiently prove the fact, that it formed part of a secret arrangement between the Prussians and French, that the former should not be molested in their retreat. Thus miserably terminated an expedition, which had excited the attention, and fixed the hopes, of the continent, and on which, in a certain degree, the fate of Europe depended.—Its issue tended to increase the audacity, and to inspirit the exertions of the French rebels, who had alre[illegible] planned the subjugation of the neighb[illegible] States, and the establishment of an [illegible] empire. It was begun without d[illegible] it was conducted without co[illegible] was ended without honour. [illegible] sia, while he injured th[illegible] pro-fessed an anxiety to s[illegible] his con-sequence and his [illegible] the seeds

of that destruction which, fourteen years after, his Monarchy was doomed to experience.

At an interview, which took place at the village of Glorieux, in the vicinity of Verdun, on the 11th of October, between the Prussian General, Kalkreuth, and the French Generals, Galbaud and Arthur Dillon; the last, who was an Irishman, and who made his religion a pretext for entering into the service of the natural enemies of his country, told the Prussians, that the French revolution had been brought about by the experience of fourteen centuries: that the whole nation had but one opinion respecting it; that they had reason to wonder, that foreign powers should interfere with their domestic concerns, or should dread their ambition, particularly after their sublime declaration of beginning no war with a view to conquest;—a declaration which ought, he asserted, to procure to France as many friends as there were philosophers in Europe.*

The falsehood of this assertion was known to the French General, at the moment when he made it. He knew perfectly, that the war against Austria was made expressly with a view to the conquest of the Netherlands;—that Avignon, and the Comtat, had been wrested

* Histoire de France, par Toulongeon.—Piéces justificatives. Tom. II. p. 152.

from the Pope and annexed to France; and that the reduction of Savoy was undertaken from a similar motive. In short, the conduct of the French rulers was essentially aggressive;—and the plan was already laid, as Brissot has acknowledged, by these philanthropic professors of peace, to extend the flames of war, so as to set fire to the four corners of Europe.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Reflections on the effects which recent occurrences in France ought to have produced on the early admirers of the French Revolution in England—Effects which they *really* produced—Addresses from English clubs to the French convention—Factious Address from a Society at Newington—Address from the Revolution Society, signed by Dr. Towers, congratulating the French on the deposition of their Monarch, and on the successful exercise of "*The Right of Insurrection*"—United address from societies at Manchester, Norwich, and London, imprecating the destruction of Monarchy through the world—Address of the Constitutional Society, anticipating a national convention in England, accompanied by a present of shoes to the military rebels of France—The President's answer to the address, announcing the near approach of a republic in England—Great confidence of the disaffected in the autumn of 1792—Critical state of the country—Mr. Reeves—His arrival in England---Origin of the Loyal Associations---Their rapid extension, and salutary effects---Their end and object explained--Wholly unconnected with government---Mr. Pitt doubts their policy, and intimates a wish for their suppression---The founders of the associations refuse to comply with the wish---Mr. Pitt changes his opinion, and expresses his approbation of the first committee appointed

---Expenses of the associations, wholly defrayed by the voluntary contributions of the Members---List of the Committee---Mr. Thomas Law---He is expelled from the Committee---Motives of that expulsion---Striking change in the internal appearance of the country — General burst of loyalty—Mr. Pitt appointed warden of the Cinque Ports—Parliament meet—The King's speech—Debates on the address—Loyal association abused by the opposition, who condemn a doctrine which they do not understand—Their censure of a printed paper, by the Reverend William Jones, of Nayland—That paper defended —Mr. Fox again avows his admiration of the French revolution—Motion for the amendment lost by a majority of two hundred and forty—New motion, by Mr. Fox, for opening a negotiation with the French republic—His praise of the French troops, and his abuse of the allied powers—Seconded by Mr. Sheridan—Opposed by Mr. Burke — Motion negatived without a division---Unanimity of Parliament, in condemning the trial and approaching murder of the French King---Alien bill introduced by Mr. Pitt---Reflections upon it---Opposed by Mr. Fox---Mr. Fox's inconsistency exposed by Mr. Burke---Atheism, the first fruits of French liberty---Daggers manufactured at Birmingham---One of these produced, by Mr. Burke, in the House of Commons---Kersaint's testimony to the neutrality of the Engli[sh] Murder of Louis XVI---Dismissal of Chauvelin---[H]is message---Debate on it---Mr. Pitt's speech---[H]is the recent murder of the virtuous Louis ---[c]onsequences to be derived from that event, conside[red] illustrative of French principles---[F]rench constitution---Memorable decre[e] ---[U]n-vention, for encouraging i[n]---[U]nited States —Strict neutrality of En[g]---[c]onduct of France demonstra[ted] ---[t]hanks to his

Majesty, moved by Mr. Pitt—Observations on Mr. Pitt's conduct at this time---Speech of Mr. Fox---He asserts *the Sovereignty of the People, as paramount to all laws*, and their *right to cashier Kings for misconduct* ---The tendency of such declarations---Constant and earnest endeavours of Mr. Pitt to prevent a war, proved by the French agents themselves---Conference proposed by Dumouriez, with Lord Auckland and M. Von Spieghel---Communications on that subject---Lord Auckland receives instructions to hold the conference---Place appointed for the purpose---The French convention send orders to Dumouriez not to hold it.

[1792.] It was natural to suppose, that those scenes which had occurred in France, during the year 1792, and of which a faint sketch has been given in the preceding chapter, were such as would excite the indignation and abhorrence of every mind which had a respect for the principles of humanity, justice, and social order; that they would even be sufficient to produce a radical change of opinion in those who had, from the love of liberty, and from the hatred of despotism, hailed the first dawn of the French revolution, as the signal of approaching happiness to the civilized world. This supposition was natural, because the most superficial observer, who had paid any attention to those occurrences, could not fail to perceive that, instead of favouring the cause of freedom, they were calculated to destroy every vestige

of liberty, and to raise up, on the ruins of a monarchy, a turbulent anarchy, incompatible with social happiness, and the most odious despotism which had ever bent the necks of a people beneath its iron yoke. Liberty never erects her throne in a land whence Justice has been banished; Law is her parent and protector; Riot and Mis-rule are her enemies; Treason and Murder are her destroyers.

These considerations, however, did not produce their natural effect on the minds of those discontented Englishmen, who, having early adopted French principles, were eager to reduce them to practice in their native land. It was not difficult to persuade those who preferred idleness to industry, and those whom nature had destined to pursue the more humble paths of life, or those who aspired to wealth and power, without the merit or the means of obtaining either, that a revolution, which would destroy all distinctions of rank and property, and which would place them upon a level with those who had hitherto filled the upper parts in the social pyramid, was

"A consummation devoutly to be wished."

Nor was it more difficult to make them believe that, as a complete success had crowned the

efforts of the French revolutionists, their own exertions would terminate in the full gratification of all their wishes. Stimulated by these motives, and fired by these hopes, the seditious clubs acquired fresh activity and strength; and new clubs, all connected with each other, or, to use the new jargon of revolutionary France, *affiliated*, sprung up in every quarter of the kingdom. *Reform* was the *pretext* of all; *revolution* the *object* of most. The members made common cause with the French jacobins, whom they considered as their great models and masters; they deplored their defeats with tears,—they hailed their successes with exultation. After the rebellious attack upon the royal palace, on the 10th of August, and the arbitrary imprisonment of the Royal Family, not only without the sanction of any law, but in express violation of an existing law, and even of a fundamental principle of that constitution which they, and their friends in England, affected to admire, the National Convention continued to receive addresses of congratulation from this country.

In these addresses, a society at *Newington* took the lead: but their address, though signed the 29th of October, was not presented till the 7th of November. After congratulating the Convention on the expulsion of the allied armies from their territory, they told them, that

their wise decrees had enlightened Europe,—and, like the rays of the sun, would soon enlighten the four parts of the world: and, as if they feared that this metaphorical language would not be sufficiently intelligible to the philosophic legislators of France, they concluded with a more direct invitation, by complimenting the Convention on *their undertaking to deliver from slavery and despotism the brave nations which bordered their frontiers.*—"*How holy,*" said they, in a burst of rebellious sensibility, "*is the humanity which prompts you to break their chains!*"

The address of the Revolution Society is remarkable as being signed by Dr. Towers, and as containing an express congratulation on the success of the treasonable insurrection of the 10th of August, which put an end to the monarchy, and as observing a profound silence on the massacres of September, as if they were not worthy of a thought. Indeed, many of the very members of the Convention, whom they hailed as the patrons of liberty, were the authors and instigators of those horrible butcheries, which future ages will scarcely credit.—"ABOVE ALL," said these solemn and deliberate encouragers of rebellion and regicide, "we rejoice in the late revolution of the 10th of *August*, so *necessary* to *secure* to you the advantages which the former had taught you to expect; and we anticipate with pleasure

the moment at which you shall have finished your labours, and established a wise and equitable government, which *must be* the admiration of the friends of man, and the cause of terror and despair to tyrants." These gentlemen, too, could not refrain from expressing the pleasure which they felt on "beholding, that THE RIGHT OF INSURRECTION had been successfully exercised in so large a country as that of the French Republic."

On the 7th of November, a joint address, from four different societies, two at Manchester, one at Norwich, and another in London, and signed by Mr. Maurice Margarot, and by Thomas Hardy, the shoemaker, was read in the convention. Its language was bold and plain; and the men who drew it up took little pains to conceal their wishes, their views, or their object. They represented themselves as an *oppressed part of mankind*, whose cause was intimately connected with that of the French jacobins, degraded by an oppressive system of inquisition, the insensible, but continual encroachments of which had quietly deprived the English nation of its boasted liberty, and reduced it almost to that abject state of slavery from which the French had *so gloriously* emancipated themselves. — *Five thousand English citizens*, they said, fired with indignation, had

the courage to step forward in order to rescue their country from that opprobrium which had been thrown upon it by the base conduct of those who were invested with power. They then imprecated vengeance on the head of the man who should attempt to dissolve the friendship which subsisted between themselves and the French jacobins. They observed, that their number would appear very small, when compared with the rest of the nation; but they asserted, that it increased every day; and that, in spite of the efforts of authority to overcome the timid, knowledge made a rapid progress among Englishmen, who were intent on ascertaining the nature of liberty, and the extent of their rights. "*Frenchmen,*" said they, "*you are already free, but Britons are preparing to be so!*"—As Frenchmen had obtained the species of *freedom* which they now enjoyed, by the destruction of their King, their nobles, and their priests, it was evidently meant, by these reformers, that Britons were preparing to secure the same freedom, by the same means;—and a more explicit avowal of their intentions scarcely any words could convey.—Indeed, they observed that, in the endeavour to discover their cruel enemies, they had found them in the partisans of that destructive aristocracy by which their bosom was torn—an aristocracy

which had hitherto been the bane of all the countries upon earth; and which the convention had acted wisely in banishing from France.

In allusion to the operations of the combined powers, they said they saw, without concern, that the Elector of Hanover united his troops to those of traitors and robbers; but the King of England would do well to remember, that England was not Hanover, — should *he* forget it, *they* would not. They expressed an earnest anxiety to promote a triple alliance, *not of crowned heads*, but of the *people* of America, France, and Great Britain, which would give liberty to Europe, and peace to the world.— It was not very easy to perceive how the assistance of the Americans could contribute to give liberty to the nations of Europe, though the motives which induced these reformers to select the French and Americans, as the only people on earth who were worthy to be allied to the English, were perfectly obvious; since they were the only people who had successfully rebelled against their lawful Sovereigns, and who had overthrown the established constitutions of their respective countries. — Such liberty, and such peace, as the French had secured for themselves, and as the English jacobins wished to obtain for their own country,

they seemed to think could not be purchased too dearly. No loss, they thought, however bloody, could be comparable to the glorious and unexampled advantage of being able to say—*The universe is free! Tyrants and tyranny are no more! Peace reigns on the earth; and it is to the French that mankind are indebted for it!**

Messieurs Joel Barlow and John Frost, deputed from the Constitutional Society of London, presented an address, breathing much the same spirit, and couched in much the same language, to the National Convention, on the 28th of November. One of these deputies prefaced the address with a speech, in which, after due congratulations on the success of revolutionary principles, and treasonable conduct in France, he assured the Convention, that innumerable societies, of the same sort, were forming themselves, at that moment, in every part of England. Their object was to reform the abuses of government, by the most simple means. And, that no doubt might remain, as to the nature of those means, the orator immediately added, by way of explanation,—"After the *example* given by *France*,

* *A Collection of Addresses, transmitted by certain English Clubs to the National Convention of France, &c.* 8vo. *p. p.* 16. 18.

'REVOLUTIONS will *become easy*;—reason is about to make a rapid progress; and IT WOULD NOT BE EXTRAORDINARY IF, IN A MUCH LESS SPACE OF TIME THAN CAN BE IMAGINED, THE FRENCH SHOULD SEND ADDRESSES OF CONGRATULATION TO A NATIONAL CONVENTION OF ENGLAND!"—This speech perfectly corresponds with the style and sentiments of the address itself, which hailed the Convention as the representatives of a *sovereign people*, and benefactors of mankind; and which, besides general congratulations on the success of the rebellion, marked each period of peculiar infamy as fit subjects of specific applause.—"Every successive epoch in your political regeneration has EACH added something to the triumph of liberty; and the GLORIOUS VICTORY, of the 10th of August, has finally prepared the way for a constitution which, enlightened as you are, we trust will be established on the basis of nature and reason.'—But the sentiment which renders this address particularly applicable to the history of the present period, is contained in the concluding sentence, in which it is asserted, that other nations would soon follow the steps of the French in their career of improvement, and, rising from their lethargy, *would arm themselves for the purpose of claiming the Rights of Man, with that all powerful voice*

*which man could not resist.** Here was a clear acknowledgement of the *intention* of the seditious clubs, in this country, to overturn the existing constitution by force. The address was signed by Lord Sempill, as President of the Society; by Daniel Adams, as Secretary; and by the two deputies, Barlow and Frost.—It was accompanied by a patriotic gift of one thousand pair of shoes for the French soldiers.

The President of the Convention entered into the true spirit of the proceeding, hailed the deputies as *generous republicans*, and anticipated *the moment in which the French would carry congratulations to the National Convention of England!* About the same time, the Convention was addressed by an English society, established at Paris, who announced the approaching meeting of Parliament, when a reform, in the national representation, would certainly take place; and "FROM THENCE TO THE ENTIRE ESTABLISHMENT OF A REPUBLIC the transition would be easy." Various other addresses, of a similar nature and tendency, were presented at this period.

These publications, and many others, which issued from the press in various forms, and which were circulated with incredible industry,

* Ibid. p. 29. 31.

were all strongly indicative, not merely of the sentiments, but of the views and designs, of a great number of disaffected persons in this country, who, encouraged by the success of the French, hoped to produce a Revolution in England, on French principles. That these men were very numerous is most certain; though they meant to deceive others, and were possibly deceived themselves, (forming their conclusions rather on their wishes than on their knowledge) as to the real extent of their numbers. They were sufficient, however, to inspire not only the government, but the well-disposed part of the public, (certainly constituting an immense majority) with great and serious alarm. In the Autumn of 1792, they spoke with confidence of their success; and had probably persuaded themselves that they should succeed. In France the revolution had been begun, and far advanced, by less formidable numbers;—and had the disaffected in England had the same resources, and as active a leader, though it is not likely they would have met with the same success, it is most certain that they might have excited a civil war, and that great confusion and bloodshed would have ensued.

They had also another advantage, in the want of union among those who abhorred their

principles, and were solicitous to counteract their efforts. They themselves met in their various societies, and kept up a regular correspondence with each other, throughout the kingdom. Their enemies, on the contrary, had no meetings,—had no centre of union,—had no means of communication;—the evil was deeply felt, and generally acknowledged; but no remedy was adopted, or even suggested. At this alarming and critical period, a circumstance occurred which supplied one of those striking proofs (many of which must have fallen under every man's observation) of the great public good which may sometimes be effected by the talents and perseverance of a private individual, without the aid of official authority.

On the 17th of November, Mr. Reeves, a barrister, who had gone out to Newfoundland, some months before, in the capacity of chief justice to that settlement, returned to London. Having, during his absence, had little intercourse with Europe, he was surprised, beyond measure, to find, on his arrival in the capital, that a great change had taken place in the state of the public mind. The rapid progress of French principles, and the consequent dismay which it excited among the well-disposed part of the community, were, indeed, well calculated to create both alarm and indignation in a man who loved his

native country, and who venerated her constitution as the fertile source of every civil and social blessing. He was astonished to learn that the populace had betrayed strong symptoms of a turbulent and intractable spirit; and that men of sense and discernment had deemed it necessary to provide themselves with arms, under the impression that they should soon be called upon to use them in their own defence.

The very day after his arrival, Mr. Reeves had a consultation with a small party of his legal friends, one of them a respectable judge, now no more; another who actually enjoys a seat on the bench;—and a third at present in a high official situation. At this meeting it was determined that the most proper antidote to be opposed to the prevailing poison of the day, was that which counter-associations, composed of loyal and well-affected men, would supply; and Mr. Reeves undertook to create them in a short time. He accordingly drew up an appropriate advertisement, which, operating like an electric shock, produced the desired effect. The public spirit manifested itself with the rapidity of lightning; crowds instantly flocked to the appointed place of meeting;—and it became evident, that nothing more than a rallying point, which the well-directed zeal of an individual had now supplied, had been wanting to

which the real friends of the country might repair, in order to combine their efforts for the resistance of that rising spirit of disaffection which had already assumed so alarming an aspect.

Such was the eagerness of individuals for a public declaration of their sentiments, and such the zeal and activity which marked the conduct of the worthy father of the Loyal Associations, that not more than ten days elapsed between the first conception, and the final execution, of this most seasonable and well-digested plan. A committee, consisting of nineteen independent gentlemen, of different descriptions, was formed; appropriate resolutions were communicated to the public; and, in a very short time, the spirit of loyalty spread through the country, and gave birth to similar meetings in every part of the kingdom.

In one of the first of these well-written and impressive papers, which the able pen of Mr. Reeves supplied, the end and object of these associations were clearly defined, and explicitly avowed; the discouragement and suppression of seditious publications, and the supply of cheap books and papers, for the purpose of undeceiving those poor people who had been misled by the infusion of opinions dangerous to their own welfare and that of the state: the members also agreed to hold themselves in rea-

diness to prevent or suppress tumults or riots, if necessary.—But they wisely resolved, in all their proceedings, to act in constant subordination to the magistrates and the executive government, and in their aid and support, and not otherwise; well aware that their enemies would not fail to accuse them of pursuing a similar course themselves to that which they condemned in others. They strongly marked the difference between the seditious societies and the loyal associations. They declared their opinion, that all private meetings, formed with a design to take cognizance of what was transacted by the executive and legislative powers of the country, were irregular. Such distinct and unharmonious centres they described as having the effect of drawing around themselves some of that force and confidence of the people, which should pass on to their only true centre—the constituted, executive, and legislative authorities of the state. But, they observed, when such an irregularity had been once permitted, and the balance of the system seemed to be affected by it, the equilibrium, perhaps, could not be more naturally restored, than by placing a counterpoise of the same sort on the other side.

Wicked men, by the means of clubs and associations, had been spreading among the simple and ignorant, seditious opinions, destructive of

good government, and the happiness of all.—Good men associated to counteract these evil designs, to support good government, and to continue to all their present happiness. To associate in the forms in which the disaffected did, (as appeared by their printed papers) was always seditious, and very often treasonable;—they all appeared to be offenders against the law. To meet, as was now proposed, for suppressing sedition, for propagating peaceable opinions, and for aiding the magistracy, in subordination to the direction of the magistrates, the law allowed it, and the time required it.*

Such were the avowed objects of associations, which, in a few days, changed, as it were, the whole face of the country.—The voice of disaffection, lately so loud, was now silenced, or, at least, reduced to the necessity of uttering its murmurs in private. Confidence succeeded to doubt, apprehension, and dismay; and the hands of government were strengthened by the almost unanimous assurances of adequate support, in the arduous struggle in which it was easy to foresee they must, and would soon be involved.

Well might it be observed, a few months after the establishment of the first Loyal Asso-

* Association Papers, p. 8.

ciation, that it was the general opinion, that the declaration of sentiment which resulted from the forming of associations throughout the kingdom, saved this nation at a time when nothing else could have saved it. The success which attended their endeavours was not tarnished by any thing unworthy or unequal in their subsequent conduct. As they opposed themselves to the madness of sedition with spirit, so they proceeded in their career with firmness, and they bore their success with moderation.

They associated on a special occasion, and for a defined purpose; and when that occasion was passed, and that purpose was served, they suspended their proceedings.—They combined for no private or partial views; not to extol or to depress any party or any individual; their object was general, and they pursued it on general principles. It was neither to set up nor to pull down; it was only to preserve;—an employment free from the heat and malice of personal animosities; they could have no enemies but such as the law would term offenders.*

It was by no means an unnatural supposition, that a scheme, fraught with so much public benefit, had been conceived by Ministers, or, at least, aided and encouraged by them:

* Ibid. Preface, p. iii. iv.

assertions, indeed, to this effect were advanced with confidence, but in direct opposition to the fact. The first intelligence which the government received of it was from the printed advertisements in the daily papers; their curiosity was, of course, excited, and they soon learnt by whom the plan was conceived, digested, and executed. Mr. Pitt, far from giving his countenance or concurrence to it, in the first instance, had great doubts of its policy and expediency. He, indeed, in a very early stage of the business, expressed his wish that a total stop should be put to all further proceedings, as he had it in contemplation to frame a bill for the prevention of all political meetings whatever, except such as were necessary for the exercise of the constitutional right of petition. But, although this plan had been adopted with expedition, it had not been executed without much reflection on its nature and consequences. It was the work, too, of one who knew the law and constitution of the country as well as the Minister himself, and who was, probably, better acquainted with the temper and disposition of the people. Mr. Reeves, and those who now acted with him, conceived themselves competent judges of the remedy best adapted to the peculiar circumstances of the times; they were impressed with the conviction, that the period had at length arrived when men must take care

of themselves; and, knowing that assemblies of respectable individuals, acting in strict subordination to the constituted authorities of the country, were perfectly legal, they refused to comply with the wishes of Mr. Pitt. The Minister, however, on farther reflection, altered his mind; he expressed his approbation of the committee, when their names were read to him;*

* It is the duty of the historian to record the names of those men who first stood forward to stem the torrent of faction which threatened to overwhelm the fair fabric of the Constitution, and who thus set a glorious example to their dismayed countrymen. The following gentlemen composed the committee:

John Reeves, Esq.	Mr. George Potter.
John Topham, Esq.	Charles Townshend, Esq.
John Bowles, Esq.	Dr. Halifax.
John Roberts, Esq.	Mr. Alexander Brodie.
Mr. John Sewell.	Hon. G. Hobart.
Peter Nouaille, Esq.	Thomas Plumer, Esq.
Thomas Law, Esq.*	Charles Yorke, Esq.
Mr. John Sargeaunt.	George Ward, Esq.
John Thomas Batt, Esq.	W. Devaynes, Esq.

* It would appear that Mr. Law had introduced himself to this meeting with a view rather to act as a spy on the conduct of its members, than to assist them in the execution of their plan.—For, in little more than three weeks after the association was formed, having differed in opinion from the whole of the committee, on a question relating to anonymous informations, he had recourse to the extraordinary proceeding of appealing to the public, through the medium of the *Morning Chronicle*, for

and, although he never afforded the associations the smallest pecuniary, or other, assistance,

the purpose of justifying himself, and of accusing his associates. The point in dispute was simply this,—The mother society became the centre to which intelligence of various kinds was transmitted, relating to the objects for which the members had associated.—Some of these communications contained information against persons who had made open declarations of seditious sentiments, or treasonable designs. The accumulation of such papers rendered it necessary for the committee to decide what should be done with them. They, accordingly, considering that they had no authority themselves, and being of opinion that these matters were not wholly to be despised, resolved to send them to those persons in office who could take legal cognizance of them; and they were thenceforth transmitted, either to the Secretary of State, or to the chief magistrate of the office in Bow-street. This resolution, the most wise and prudent that could be adopted, displeased Mr. Law, who sent it to the *Morning Chronicle*; and, by that means, gave rise to one of the most senseless clamours which the tongue of party ever propagated against the Association, for encouraging anonymous letters and anonymous information.

On the first subsequent meeting of the committee, it was unanimously agreed to erase the name of Mr. Law from the list of its members; at the same time they passed the following resolutions, as explanatory of their motives in this particular act, and as expressive of their sentiments on the subject which gave rise to it.

"The committee are sorry they are under the necessity "of coming to such a resolution with regard to one of their "members; but it appears to them that the harmony which "should be preserved in any society can never subsist without "an entire confidence in every one of its members, and this

he felt and thought, as every real unprejudiced friend of the country must have felt and thought, respecting the important services which they rendered to the state at a crisis of peculiar alarm, and of imminent danger.

The expenses attending the circulation of cheap pamphlets and papers, and all other costs incurred by this association, were defrayed entirely by the voluntary contributions of its

" they think can no longer be reposed in a person who pub-
" lishes, in a common newspaper, any thing that relates to what
" passes at their meetings.

" With respect to that gentleman's proposal (in which he
" stood single) to burn all letters from anonymous correspon-
" dents, merely because they were such, the committee conti-
" nue to hold the same opinion they then did, and which, they
" believe, is the opinion held by most persons who ever
" thought upon the subject. They have always treated anony-
" mous information as an individual would treat it; if it
" appeared probable, and of a nature that deserved notice, they
" have thought it might be made a ground of inquiry; if other-
" wise, that it should be disregarded entirely. In acting thus,
" they believe they have discharged the duty of good citizens,
" as well as that of persons who have associated for the ex-
" press purpose of defending the Laws and Constitution of
" their country." *Association Papers, p. 3, 4.*

Mr. Thomas Law afterwards emigrated to America, (to that very country which the disaffected, at this period, held up as an example and model to England) where he settled, and has ever since remained. This act of self-banishment is, of itself, sufficient to characterize the motives which induced him to become a member of the Loyal Association.

members, which, however, never exceeded a few hundred pounds. Though the expense was little, the benefit was great. But the chief advantage derived from those meetings, was the encouragement afforded to that general declaration of sentiment, which was the most effectual means of suppressing disaffection in the bud, of crushing the rising hopes of treason, and of driving the monster, Sedition, into the inmost recesses of its den. At the same time, they gave confidence to government, and strength to the efforts of the nation.

The Minister now began to assume a tone of greater decision, and to pursue a more marked and determined line of conduct. Military preparations were made, as in a time of acknowledged danger; the militia were suddenly embodied, and Parliament was summoned, under a special provision, before the expiration of the period for which it had been prorogued.

Such was the state of the country when the great council of the nation was opened on the 13th of December.—The King observed to his Parliament, that he should have been happy, if he could have announced to them the secure and undisturbed continuance of all the blessings which his subjects had derived from a state of tranquillity; but events had recently

occurred which required their united vigilance and exertion, in order to preserve the advantages which they had hitherto enjoyed. The seditious practices which had been, in a great measure, checked by their firm and explicit declaration in the last Session, and by the general concurrence of his people in the same sentiments, had of late been more openly renewed, and with increased activity. A spirit of tumult and disorder (the natural consequence of such practices) had shewn itself in acts of riot and insurrection, which required the interposition of a military force in support of the civil magistrate. The industry employed to excite discontent, on various pretexts, and in different parts of the kingdom, had appeared to proceed from a design to attempt the destruction of our happy constitution, and the subversion of all order and government; and this design had evidently been pursued in connection and concert with persons in foreign countries.

His Majesty dwelt on his careful observance of a strict neutrality, in the war then raging on the Continent, and on his uniform abstinence from any interference with respect to the internal affairs of France. Indeed, it became evident, from subsequent events, that this caution, however laudable the motive from

which it proceeded, had been carried to a dangerous and impolitic excess;—for, had the British Minister entered early, and heartily, into the continental confederacy, for checking the aggressive disposition, the turbulent spirit, and the hostile intentions, of the political fanatics of France, it is highly probable that a different turn might have been given to the revolution; that a system of rational liberty might have been established; that the lives of millions might have been saved; and that the French annals might have been secured against the disgrace which the commission of nameless and numberless crimes has indelibly impressed upon them.

It was impossible, however, for the King to see, (as he told his Parliament) without the most serious uneasiness, the strong and increasing indications which had appeared in France, of an intention to excite disturbances in other countries, to disregard the rights of neutral nations, and to pursue views of conquest and aggrandizement, as well as to adopt, towards his allies, the Dutch, (who had observed the same neutrality with himself) measures which were neither conformable to the law of nations, nor to the positive stipulations of existing treaties.

Such were the reasons assigned, in the Speech from the Throne, for the defensive mea-

sures which the Ministers had lately adopted, and which they considered as equally calculated for the preservation of internal tranquillity, and for giving efficacy to their efforts for securing a continuance of the blessings of peace. The debates, on the address, afforded the usual opportunity to the members of both Houses, for declaring their different opinions on the state of public affairs. Mr. Pitt, having lately accepted the office of Warden of the Cinque Ports, which vacated his seat, was not present at the opening of Parliament. Mr. Dundas, therefore, took the lead in defending the conduct of Ministers, and was most ably supported by Mr. Burke and Mr. Windham;—the opposition was led by Mr. Fox, who was followed by Lord Wycombe. The reality of the alleged dangers constituted the principal ground of difference. Mr. Fox denied their existence, and called for specific proofs; while the Ministers insisted on the notoriety of the facts, as affording the most convincing proofs. The danger stared every man in the face; and, but a few weeks before, had spread dismay among all the well-affected part of the community;—yet was it confidently asserted, in the House of Commons, that the assertions in the speech were all false and calumnious; that nothing like disaffection was to be seen in the kingdom, but

that an universal spirit of loyalty pervaded every quarter. The measures taken to prevent the effects of a danger, the existence of which was so confidently denied, were represented as fraudulent, unnecessary, and intended only as the means by which the passions of the country might be inflamed, and the design of the Minister, to plunge the nation in a continental war, be favoured and supported. But even granting, for the sake of argument, that some discontent might prevail, the remedies prescribed, by the quacks of opposition, as infallible specifics, were *a repeal of the test and corporation acts*, and *a reform of the House of Commons*. That the House of Commons required *reformation*, was a question which admitted of little doubt; but they must have been wretched empirics indeed, who could prescribe for their own country the very remedies which had proved fatal to the Monarchy of France. Unbounded concession had relaxed all the energies of government; and indiscriminate reform accomplished its destruction. The French King, unhappily, followed the very advice here given to the British Monarch. He, weakly and vainly, attempted to silence the clamours of disaffection, by an easy compliance with every demand.—The natural consequence followed; the claimants became more importunate,

as his facility increased; till *they* COMMANDED, and *he* SUED IN VAIN.

The opposition attacked the loyal associations, and represented them as more dangerous than the seditious clubs. They even charged them with attempts to poison the minds of the people, by promulgating the Tory doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance; a doctrine which they who condemned it evidently did not understand. They seem to have forgotten, too, that, without the aid of the Tories, the revolution of 1688 would never have been accomplished. The tract, circulated by the association, at the Crown and Anchor, which most excited the indignation of the modern Whigs, was one entitled, *A Letter from Thomas Bull to his brother John*, which was the production of the venerable MR. JONES, of *Nayland*, who had more attentively studied, and more ably appreciated, the British constitution, and the relative duties of the Sovereign and of his subjects, than Mr. Fox, and the whole band of juvenile politicians, who now clamoured in his train.

The assertions of the opposition, respecting the cause and the object of the late preparations, were fully contradicted by the Ministers; who insisted, that they were imperatively called for by the alarming state of the country; and by the

conduct of the ruling party in France. They proved, from the various addresses presented by the factious members of the jacobin clubs in England, to the French convention, by the violent resolutions which they had published, and by the seditious pamphlets which they had circulated, the reality of that danger, and the existence of that disaffection, which had been imputed in the speech from the throne. They clearly demonstrated, also, from the public declarations of the leading men in France, their fixed determination to render their principles and their arms the means of producing similar revolutions in other countries; and of aggrandizing their own at their expense. In violation of their own decrees, and in contempt of existing treaties, they had annexed Savoy to France, and opened the navigation of the Scheldt.

In the course of this discussion, Mr. Fox took an opportunity of renewing his expressions of attachment to the principles and the patriots of France, triumphing in their triumphs, and lamenting over their defeats!—In short, he seemed to conceive that he had gone too far, in his avowed admiration of the French revolution to retract, and that his only chance for distinction, now that he was forsaken by all that was respectable in his party, was by becoming the

chief of a new faction, by encouraging its members to proceed to the greatest extremities, and, by his countenance, and indirect support, to stimulate them to the avowal of principles, and of designs, which he would not himself dare to acknowledge. He moved an amendment to the address, which was negatived by a majority of two hundred and forty.

Decisive as this majority unquestionably was, it did not deter Mr. Fox from renewing his opposition to the address on the succeeding night, when the report was brought up. He then, however, deemed it expedient to modify his sentiments, by declaring his belief, that the aggrandizement of France ought to be watched with a jealous eye by Great Britain. But, in his opinion, the best mode of preventing its evil effects would be to conciliate the favour, and to court the alliance, of the French republic, whose cause, he asserted, was daily becoming more popular on the Continent; while no reliance could be placed on either Prussia or Austria, the leaders of whose armies were destitute alike of honour and of humanity.—Mr. Fox concluded this philippic on the enemies of France, with a motion, the object of which was, to intreat the King to exert all the arts of negotiation for the preservation of peace with the French Republic.

Mr. Fox's motion was seconded by Mr. Sheridan, and opposed by Mr. Burke, who aptly observed, that if no reliance could now be placed on the fidelity of our allies, it was not likely to be secured in future by paying court to their implacable enemies.—Nor, if we were disposed to submit to such degradation, were we, by any means, certain of attaining our object. And yet the country were called upon to renounce their existing connections with the ancient and established governments in Europe, for the purpose of crouching, without effect, to a species of republic, which bore no analogy to any other which was, or ever had been, in the world; a republic founded on principles of universal seduction, union, and confraternity, so wild in her ambitious projects, and views of Proselytism, as to aim at the subversion of all other forms of government, and the substitution of her own in their stead. Like the propagator of the doctrine of the Koran, with a new-fangled code of opinions in one hand, and the sword in the other, she was resolved to enforce conviction on surrounding nations, and compel them to adopt her own system of revolutionary freedom. Mr. Fox's motion was negatived without a division. Still Mr. Fox was not discouraged.—He renewed the discussion the very next day, when he proposed

that an ambassador should be sent to France to treat with those persons who exercised, provisionally, the functions of the executive government in that country. This proposal, however, for opening a treaty with rebels and traitors, who had overthrown the Monarchy, and were about to murder the Monarch, was indignantly rejected by a great majority of the House.

But although, on these important points, a radical difference of opinion, and indeed of principle, prevailed, the members of both parties were unanimous in their sentiments respecting the approaching fate of the unhappy Louis. Mr. Sheridan, on the 20th of December, introduced the subject, and expressed his conviction that the public mind, throughout France, would be considerably influenced, could it be known that the unjust and inhuman act of cruelty about to be committed was universally deprecated and deplored by the people of Great Britain. Mr. Fox expressed similar sentiments,—observing, that the manner in which the Royal Family of France were treated, was unjust, cruel, and pusillanimous.—He was of opinion, that the best mode of treating a subject so delicate, would be to address the King for a copy of the instructions sent to Lord Gower on his recal, and then to thank

his Majesty for the communication, adding some expressions of abhorrence against the late transactions in France. In this opinion, Mr. Pitt concurred, and he immediately moved for the instructions, observing, at the same time, that, although to solicit any thing from France would be to solicit the eternal disgrace of this country, yet he considered it extremely proper to express as general an abhorrence as possible of the miserable and horrid catastrophe with which the French King was, at that moment, threatened. But when the papers were produced the next day, it was judged to be the safest way, merely to move that they might lie on the table of the House for the members to peruse; it being apprehended that a vote, expressive of the sentiments of the House, might probably accelerate the event which it was intended to avert. Mr. Fox truly characterized the trial of Louis the Sixteenth, as repugnant to all the common feelings of mankind, and contrary to all the fundamental principles of law. The same subject was adverted to, in the House of Lords, by the Marquis of Lansdowne, who proposed to send an ambassador to France; but Lord Grenville successfully opposed the motion, on which no division took place. In the course of his speech the Marquis, alluding to the present situation of the French King, observed, that such a Prince was not a proper object of punishment,

who, during a reign of sixteen years, had made the happiness of his subjects his constant study.

Among the measures of precaution which Mr. Pitt now deemed necessary for the preservation of public order, was a bill for subjecting Aliens to particular regulations and restrictions. The motive which gave rise to this bill was the influx of Frenchmen into the kingdom, who came hither for the purpose of maintaining a closer communication with the seditious clubs, and for directing the efforts of their members to the subversion of the constitution; a task for which they were eminently qualified. It is a matter of considerable doubt, whether it is proper, judicious, or strictly constitutional, to have recourse to the authority of Parliament, for a legislative sanction to measures, the adoption of which is within the legal prerogative of the Crown. Such conduct is liable to a very strong objection, inasmuch as it has a natural tendency to weaken the prerogative; for as it is to be inferred that the interference of Parliament will not be called for, unless in cases of necessity, the very fact of such interference will, in time, be deemed sufficient to prove the defect of the prerogative, where no defect was ever before supposed to exist. In respect of Aliens, there could be no

doubt that the King had the power either to subject them, on their arrival in the country, to any regulations which he might deem necessary for the security of the state, or to send them out of the country, whenever he saw reason to withdraw from them that protection which it was competent to him, by the general law of nations, to grant or to refuse. The application to Parliament, therefore, could not be necessary; but it was deemed prudent by ministers, who, being responsible for any abuse, or improper exercise, of the prerogative, were better satisfied to regulate their conduct by the decision of the legislature.

This bill, though supported by the most respectable members of the opposition in both Houses, was strenuously resisted by Lords Guildford and Lauderdale, in the Upper House, and by Mr. Fox, and his few remaining followers, in the Lower House.* It occasioned

* This Alien-bill was made a subject of complaint against the British government by Mr. Chauvelin, and by the French minister, Le Brun, who described it as "rigorous, unjust, unusual, and contrary to all the usages observed by nations to each other," as well as a direct violation of the commercial treaty between the two countries. Putting the palpable falsehood of this assertion out of the question, it is curious to observe, that Mr. Le Brun here pronounced a sentence of condemnation on the French government; since, in the month of

also some further declaration of sentiment, on the part of Mr. Fox, and of those who had seceded from his party, respecting the present state of public affairs, both in England and in

May, 1792, the Legislative Assembly passed a decree against Aliens, similar in tenor to the British Act, but more offensive in its provisions. By this decree, every foreigner, without any exception, was compelled, within eight days, to declare his name and character, his usual residence, and his abode at Paris, and also to produce his passport, if he had one, to the committee of the Section, under severe penalties in case of omission. This, and the other provisions of the decree, as applied to Englishmen, were a direct breach of the article of the commercial treaty quoted by Le Brun. When this minister, too, asserted, at the same time, that the English in France had experienced every kindness, he did not more strictly adhere to truth. On the eighteenth of September, 1792, Kersaint complained to the Assembly of the scandalous treatment to which the British were exposed. "There remains," said he, "but one nation in Europe *whose neutrality, as to the affairs of France, is decidedly pronounced*---it is England. Yet there are no means left unemployed to sour the minds of those English who are now residing in France.--- At this moment there are no obstacles which are not used to shackle foreigners, *and particularly the English.* There is nothing which, since the tenth of August, the commune has left undone to irritate the latter, either by refusing them passports, or by disturbing them, in every possible manner, at the places of their habitation."

Such a testimony as that of Kersaint, one of the most violent enemies of Great Britain, is highly valuable to corroborate the assertions of Mr. Pitt, respecting the determined neutrality of the British government.

France. This only served to confirm the difference which was already known to exist between them. Mr. Burke most clearly proved that the exultation which Mr. Fox had manifested, on the success of the French, was totally inconsistent with the dread which he had expressed of the aggrandizement of France; because her aggrandizement was both the object and the consequence of their success. He expatiated, with his usual energy, on the nature of French fraternization, and of that liberty which the revolutionists were so anxious to propagate throughout Europe, by plunder and the sword; and which he truly characterized, as a liberty without property, without honour, without morals, without order, without government, and without personal security. These apostles of liberty had boasted of having destroyed the Bastille, while they had converted every man's house in Paris into a Bastille.

Mr. Burke quoted the speech of Mr. Dupont in the convention, to shew that atheism was the first fruits of French liberty. This man had profligately declared the religion of Jesus Christ to be unfit to be tolerated in a republic, because it was a monarchical religion, and preached subjection and obedience to God! And the Convention received the declaration with loud applause. He pathetically deplored

the natural effects of such systematized profligacy, which went to deprive man of all happiness in life, and of all consolation in death. He considered the Alien-bill as calculated to save the country; for, although the number of suspicious Aliens in the kingdom at this time might be small, yet it should be remembered, that the horrid massacres at Paris, in the preceding autumn, had been perpetrated by a body of men, not exceeding two hundred. He averred that, at that very moment, three thousand daggers, of a peculiar construction, were manufacturing at Birmingham, under the orders of an individual. How many of these were intended for exportation, and how many were designed for home consumption, had not yet been ascertained. He then produced one of these daggers, and threw it on the floor, exclaiming,—"These are the presents which France designs for you.—By these would she propagate her freedom and fraternity.—But may Heaven avert her principles from our minds, and her daggers from our hearts."

The debates on the bill were renewed, in its different stages, when Mr. Fox took the lead in opposing it; but it was finally carried by a decisive majority.

[1793.] The known and recorded sentiments of the British Parliament had as little

influence as a regard for justice, or attention to existing laws, on the minds of the French rebels, who had dethroned their Sovereign, and usurped his authority.—After a mock trial, in which all the forms of justice, and all the principles of law, were violated without scruple, and without reserve, the virtuous Louis was doomed to the scaffold. His murder was perpetrated on the 21st of January; and in his last moments he displayed that christian patience, resignation, and fortitude, which a consciousness of innocence, and a firm confidence in the promises of God, are alone competent to inspire. After this atrocious deed, which fixes an indelible stain on the national character of the French people, who tamely looked on while their best friend fell a victim to their ruthless tyrants, it was not possible to suffer the representative of the deceased Monarch to continue his residence at the British Court.—Mr. Chauvelin was, therefore, ordered to quit the kingdom, within eight days; and, on the 28th of the month, the King sent a message to both Houses of Parliament, informing them, that he had given directions for laying before them copies of several papers, which had been received from M. Chauvelin, by the Secretary of State, and the answers thereto; and likewise a copy of an order made

by his Majesty in Council, and transmitted, by his Majesty's commands, to the said M. Chauvelin, in consequence of the accounts of the atrocious act recently perpetrated at Paris. In the present situation of affairs, his Majesty thought it indispensably necessary to make a further augmentation of his forces by sea and land; and relied on the known affection and zeal of the House of Commons, to enable him to take the most effectual measures, in the present important juncture, for maintaining the security and rights of his own dominions; for supporting his allies; and for opposing views of aggrandizement and ambition on the part of France, which would be, at all times, dangerous to the general interests of Europe, but were peculiarly so, when connected with the propagation of principles which led to the violation of the most sacred duties, and were utterly subversive of the peace and order of all civil society.

This message was taken into consideration, by the House of Commons, on the first of February, when Mr. Pitt entered into a copious and luminous illustration of French principles, and took an extensive view of the subjects, both foreign and domestic, to which the message related. He first adverted to the murder of the King of France, which he truly

characterized as a calamitous event, as a dreadful outrage against every principle of religion, of justice, and of humanity, which had created one general sentiment of indignation and abhorrence in every part of this island, and, most undoubtedly, had produced the same effect in every civilized country. At the same time that he said this, he was aware that he should better consult, not only his own feelings, but those of the House, if considerations of duty would permit him to draw a veil over the whole of that transaction, because it was, in fact, in itself, in all those circumstances which led to it, in all which attended it, and in all which had followed, or which were likely to follow it thereafter, so full of every subject of grief and horror, that it was painful for the mind to dwell upon it. It was a subject which, for the honour of human nature, it would be better, if possible, to dismiss from our memories, to expunge from the page of history, and to conceal it, both then and for ever, from the observation of the world;

> Excidat ille dies ævo, neu postera credant
> Secula; nos certè taceamus, et obruta multâ
> Nocte tegi nostræ patiamur crimine gentis.

These were the words of a great historian of France, (de Thou) in a former period, and

were applied to an occasion (the massacre of the Protestants, on St. Bartholomew's day) which had always been considered as an eternal reproach to the French nation.—And the atrocious acts, lately perpetrated at Paris, were, perhaps, the only instances that furnished any match to that dreadful and complicated scene of proscription and blood. — But, whatever might be their feelings on that subject, since, alas! it was not possible that the present age should not be contaminated with its guilt,—since it was not possible that the knowledge of it should not be conveyed by the breath of tradition to posterity, there was a duty which we were called upon to perform,—to enter our solemn protestation, that, on every principle by which men of justice and honour were actuated, it was the foulest and most atrocious deed which the history of the world had yet had occasion to attest.

Mr. Pitt then reminded the House of another duty, which related to the interest of every country in Europe;—this was to derive from this atrocious deed all the benefit which, as a lesson, it was calculated to confer, by shewing what was the natural effect of those principles, which the French had adopted with so much eagerness, and which they propagated with so much industry. In this one instance was ex-

hibited the effect of principles, which, originally, rested upon grounds that dissolved whatever had hitherto received the best sanctions of human legislation, which were contrary to every principle of law, human and divine. Presumptuously relying on their deceitful and destructive theories, they had rejected every benefit which the world had hitherto received from the effect of either reason or experience, or even of revelation itself.—The consequences of these principles had received an illustration from the fate of one, whom every human being commiserated.—Their consequences equally tended to shake the security of commerce, and to rob the meanest individual in every country of whatever was most dear and valuable to him.

They struck directly at the authority of all regular government, and at the inviolable personal situation of every lawful Sovereign.—Mr. Pitt, therefore, felt it to be, not merely a tribute due to humanity, not merely an effusion of those feelings which he possessed in common with every man in the country, but a proper subject of reflection to fix the minds of the House on the effect of these principles, which had been thus dreadfully attested, before they proceeded to consider what measures it became the country to adopt, in order to avert their

contagion, and to prevent their growth and progress in Europe.

But, strong as his feelings were on the subject, he would intreat the House, if possible, to consider even that calamitous event as a subject rather of reason and reflection, than of sentiment and feeling. Sentiment was often unavailing, but reason and reflection would lead to that knowledge which was necessary to the salvation of this and of all other countries. He was persuaded the House would not feel it as a circumstance which they were to take upon themselves, but would feel it in the way in which he had put it, as a proof of the calamities arising out of the most abominable and detestable principles,—as a proof of the absence of all morals, of all justice, of all humanity, and of every principle which did honour to human nature;—and that it furnished the strongest demonstration of the dreadful outrage which the crimes and follies of France had suggested to them. He was persuaded that the House would be sensible that these principles, and the effects of them, were to be narrowly watched, that there could be no leading consideration more nearly connected with the prospect of all countries, and, most of all, that there could be no consideration more deserving the attention of that House, than to crush,

and destroy, principles which were so dangerous, and so destructive of every blessing which the country enjoyed under its free and excellent constitution. Most truly and emphatically did Mr. Pitt state, that we owed our present happiness and prosperity, which had never been equalled in the annals of mankind, to a mixed monarchical government. — The people felt and knew they were happy under that form of government. — They considered it as their first duty to maintain and reverence the British Constitution, which, for wise and just reasons of lasting and internal policy, attached inviolability to the sacred person of the Sovereign, though, at the same time, by the responsibility annexed to government, by the check of a wise system of laws, and by a mixture of aristocratic and democratic power in the frame of legislation, it had equally exempted itself from the danger arising from the exercise of absolute power on the one hand, and the still more dangerous contagion of popular licentiousness on the other. The equity of our laws, and the freedom of our political system, had been the envy of every surrounding nation. In this country, no man, in consequence of his riches or his rank, was so high as to be above the reach of the laws, and no individual was so poor, or so inconsiderable, as not to be within

their protection. It was the boast of the law of England, that it afforded equal security and protection to the high and the low—to the rich and to the poor.

Such was the envied situation of England, which might be compared, were the expression allowable, to the situation of the temperate zone on the surface of the globe, formed, by the bounty of Providence, for habitation and enjoyment, being equally removed from the polar frosts on the one hand, and from the scorching heat of the torrid zone on the other;—where the vicissitude of the seasons, and the variety of the climate, contributed to the vigour and health of its inhabitants, and to the fertility of its soil;—where pestilence and famine are unknown, as well as earthquakes, hurricanes, and all their dreadful consequences. — Such was the situation, the fortunate situation, of Britain; and what a splendid contrast did it form to the situation of that country, which was exposed to all the tremendous consequences of that ungovernable, that intolerable, and destroying spirit, which carried ruin and desolation wherever it went.

Principles, like these, were not the natural produce of Great Britain, and it ought, Mr. Pitt said, to be the first duty of the House, and their principal concern, to take the most

effectual measures for putting a stop to their growth and progress in this country, as well as in the other nations of Europe. After these preliminary observations, Mr. Pitt proceeded to consider more particularly the circumstances which had given rise to his Majesty's message. He divided the papers, presented to the House, into two parts, those which had been before published to the world; and those which were now made public for the first time. Previous to the meeting of Parliament, his Majesty had observed the strictest neutrality with respect to France. He had taken no part whatever in the regulation of her internal government. He had given her no cause of complaint; and, therefore, he had an undoubted right to expect, that France would cautiously avoid every measure which could furnish any ground of complaint to his majesty. He might also well expect, that France would have respected the rights of himself and of his allies. His Majesty might, most of all, expect that, in the troubled state of that country, they would not choose to attempt an interference with the internal government of this country, for the sole purpose of creating dissension among us, and of disturbing a scene of unexampled felicity. But, fortunately for England, they did not succeed.

Mr. Pitt then proceeded to analyze the papers before the House, and to draw the most just and natural inferences from their contents. In the first communication from Mr. Chauvelin, which he noticed, dated on the 12th of May, 1792, the King of France declared, in express terms, that, "religiously faithful to the constitution, whatever may be finally the fate of arms in this war, *France rejects all ideas of aggrandizement;*"—and, further, that France entertained *the most pacific dispositions*, and would, at all times, *shew respect for the laws, the customs, and the forms of government, of other nations.* Louis further proclaimed his determination, publicly and severely to disavow all those of his agents who should dare to depart, for an instant, from that respect, either by fomenting or favouring insurrections against the established order, or by interfering in any manner whatever in the interior policy of such states, "*under pretence of a proselytism which, exercised in the dominions of friendly powers, would be a real violation of the law of nations.*" Here the French government passed a sentence upon their own conduct. It was evident, Mr. Pitt observed, that the conduct of France had been directly the reverse of the principles laid down in this paper, which she had violated in every instance in which it was

in her power. In the month of June, similar professions were made by the French King, to which was added a voluntary promise to respect the rights of the allies of Great Britain. The return made to these assurances was, the observance, on the part of England, of the most rigorous neutrality.

These assurances went to three points—to a determination to abstain from views of aggrandizement;—not to interfere with the government of neutral nations, which was admitted to be a violation of the law of nations;—and to observe the rights of his majesty and his allies. Mr. Pitt then entered into a consideration of the conduct of France, under her new system, as applicable to each of these points. He shewed that she had, both by her words and actions, manifested a determination, if not checked by force, to act on principles of aggrandizement. She had completely disclaimed that maxim, "that, whatever was the fate of her arms, in war, France rejected all ideas of aggrandizement." She had employed the first moment of success publicly to contradict such declaration. She had availed herself of the success of her arms in Savoy, without even attempting the ceremony of disguise, (after having professed her determination to confine herself within her ancient limits) to annex it for ever to the new

Sovereignty of France. They had, by their decree, (of the 19th of November*) announced a termination to carry on a similar operation in every country into which their arms can be carried, with a view to do the same thing in substance, if not in name.

Their decree, of the 18th of December,†

* The decree here alluded to was drawn up in these comprehensive terms, "The National Convention declares, in the name of the French nation, that they will grant FRATERNITY *and* ASSISTANCE *to* ALL PEOPLE *who wish to* recover their liberty; and they charge the executive powers to send the necessary orders to the generals, to give assistance to such People, and to defend those citizens, who have suffered, or stit suffer, in the cause of liberty." This decree was, on the Fre tion of *Serjeant*, ordered to be "*translated*, and *printed* ALL LANGUAGES." wa nati if

† In pursuance of the principles promulgated by the decree the 19th of November, the National Convention passed another decree, on the 15th of December, by which their Generals were ordered to regulate their conduct, in the countries which their armies then occupied, or might afterwards occupy. In the preamble to this decree they expressly declared, that *their principles would not permit them to acknowledge any of the institutions militating against the Sovereignty of the People*; and the various articles exhibit a complete system of demolition. They insist on the immediate *suppression of all existing authorities*, the *abolition* of *rank and privileges* of every description; and the suppression of all existing imposts; nay, these friends to freedom even declare, they will treat as

contained a fair illustration and confirmation of their principles and designs. They had there expressly stated the plan on which they meant to act. Whenever they obtained a temporary success, whatever was the situation of the country into which they entered, whatever might have been its antecedent conduct, whatever might be its political connections, they had determined not to abandon the possession of it, till they had effected the utter and absolute subversion of its form of government, of every ancient, every established, usage, however long they might have existed, and however much they might have been revered. They would not accept, under the name of liberty, a model of government, but that which was conformable to their own opinions and ideas; and men must learn, from the mouth of their cannon the propagation of their system, in every p

enemies a whole people, *(un peuple entier)* who shall presume to reject liberty and equality, or enter into a treaty with a Prince, or privileged casts!---It is worthy of remark, that *the very day* on which this decree, containing a systematic plan for disorganizing all lawful governments, passed the Convention, the provisional Executive Council wrote to their agent Chauvelin, instructing him to disavow all hostile intentions on the part of France, and to proclaim her detestation of the idea of a war with England!---*Letter to the Earl of Lauderdale.* P. 53, 54.

of the world. They had regularly and boldly avowed these instructions, which they sent to the commissioners,* who were to carry them into execution. They had stated to them a revolutionary principle and order, for the purpose of being applied in every country in which the French arms should be crowned with success. They had stated, that they would organize every country, by a disorganizing principle; and, afterwards, they had the effrontery to assert, that all this was done by the will of the people. By that will, wherever French arms were triumphant, revolutions must take place. The plain question then occurred, what constitutes such will?—It is the power of the French. They had explained what the liberty was which they proposed to give to every nation, but to compel them to receive it by force, if they were not disposed to accept it voluntarily. They took every opportunity to destroy, wherever they went, every institution, the most sacred, and the most just; and, under the name of liberty, they had resolved to make every country, in substance, a province dependent on

* These instructions are to be found in the *Memoires historiques et politiques sur la Revolution de la Belgique et du pays de Liege.* By Publicola Chaussard, one of the commissioners.

themselves, through the despotism of Jacobin Societies. This had given a more fatal blow to the liberties of mankind, than any which they had suffered, even from the boldest attempts of the most aspiring Monarch. It was evident, therefore, that France had trampled upon all laws, human and divine. She had, at last, avowed the most insatiate ambition, and the greatest contempt for the law of nations, which all independent States had hitherto professed most religiously to observe; and, unless she was stopped in her career, all Europe must soon learn their ideas of justice,—the law of nations—models of government — and principles of liberty,—from the mouth of the French cannon.

Mr. Pitt next adverted to the practical effect of the new French system in the Netherlands. In allusion to that country, the French government, in one of its communications with the British Ministry, declared, that France "has renounced, and again renounces, every conquest; and her occupation of the low countries shall only continue during the war, and the time which may be necessary for the Belgians to ensure and consolidate their liberty; after which, they will be independent and happy. France will find her reward in their felicity." In order to prove, that this meant nothing less than the total subjection of the

people to an unqualified dependence on France, he instanced the conduct of Dumouriez, on his entrance into Brussels, where he used military force to prevent the inhabitants from destroying the tree of liberty; and the reception, by the Convention, of an address from the people of Mons, desiring that the province of Hainault might be added to France as an 85th department. This address was referred to a committee, who were instructed to report the form in which countries, wishing to unite with France, were to be admitted into the union; so that the receiving similar applications was to be a fixed and standing principle, which, in its consequences, if not timely prevented, must destroy the liberties and independence of England, as well as of all Europe.

He justly considered the decree of the 19th of November, which was ordered to be printed in all languages, as clearly extending its application to every country, and to England, of course, whatever the French government might pretend to the contrary. The explanation attempted, by which the application of the decree was confined to the single case of a declaration of the GENERAL WILL of a country, was regarded as nugatory and absurd: indeed, it was highly preposterous, because, when the people

were *unanimous* (and their unanimity is necessary to constitute the GENERAL WILL) they could have no opposition to encounter, and had, therefore, no assistance to solicit. But the whole context of the language, as well of the decree as of the discussions which preceded and followed it, and of the subsequent explanation, shewed the clearest intention to propagate their principles all over the world: their explanations contained only an avowal and repetition of the offence. They had proscribed royalty as a crime, and would not be satisfied with any thing less than its total destruction. The dreadful sentence which they had executed on their own unfortunate Monarch, applied to every Sovereign then existing.—And, lest any doubt should remain as to the design of extending their system to this country, the conduct of the National Convention had applied it, by repeated acts, to England by name, which rendered any explanation, on their part, unsatisfactory and unavailing. There was no society in England, however contemptible in their numbers, however desperate in their principles, and however questionable in their existence, who possessed the recommendations of treason and disloyalty, who were not cherished, justified, applauded, and treated even with a degree of theatrical extravagance, at the bar of the National Convention. Could

any one who read the answers given to these men, doubt, for a moment, whether England was one of the countries into which they wished to introduce a spirit of proselytism which, exercised in the dominions of friendly powers, they themselves admitted would be a violation of the law of nations?

In examining the third and last point, the violation of the rights of his Majesty, and of his allies, Mr. Pitt reprobated the aggressive conduct of France, in forcibly attempting to open the navigation of the river Scheldt, in which she had no right to interfere, unless she were Sovereign of the Low Countries, or boldly professed herself the general arbitress of Europe. Her conduct, in this instance, was greatly aggravated by the circumstance of her being bound, by the faith of solemn and recent treaties, to secure to the Dutch the exclusive navigation of the Scheldt, and to oppose the opening that river, if any other power should attempt it. If France were the Sovereign of the Low Countries, she would only succeed to the rights which were enjoyed by the House of Austria; and if she possessed the sovereignty, with all the advantage, she must also take it with all its incumbrances, of which the shutting up of the Scheldt was one. France could have no right to annul the stipulations relative to the

Scheldt, unless she had also the right to set aside, equally, all the other treaties between all the powers of Europe, and all the other rights of England or of her allies. England would never consent that France should arrogate the power of annulling, at her pleasure, and under the pretence of a natural right, of which she makes herself the only judge, the political system of Europe, established by solemn treaties, and guaranteed by all the Powers. Such a violation of right as France had been guilty of, it would be difficult to find in the history of the world. The conduct of that nation was, in the highest degree, arbitrary, capricious, and founded upon no one principle of reason or of justice. They declared that this treaty was antiquated, and either extorted by despotism, or procured by corruption.—Yet, the very last year, had this new and enlightened nation renewed her assurances of respect for all the rights of his Majesty's allies, without any exception, without any reservation, so that the advancement of this claim was directly contrary to their recent professions. From the treaty of Munster, down to the year 1785, the exclusive navigation of the Scheldt had been one of the established rights of Holland. If it were urged as a reason for not stepping forward, at such a crisis, in support of our ally, that no formal requisition had

been made for that purpose, it was contended, by Mr. Pitt, that the obvious necessity of such support was a sufficient reason for granting it; besides, it was intimated, that the sudden effect of French ambition, and of French arms, might have rendered the government of Holland afraid to make a formal requisition. But this was no reason for England to be inactive and slothful; and, unless we meant to stand by, and to suffer state after state to be subverted, and reduced under the power of France, we must now declare our firm resolution to oppose those principles of ambition and aggrandizement, which had for their object the destruction of England, of Europe, and of the World.

The next point for consideration was, whether the papers before the House contained an answer to the past, or gave any security for the future? They supplied no such answer;—they afforded no such security.—The explanations of the offensive decree of the Convention, of the 19th of November, was nothing more than an advertisement for treason and rebellion. The reception which the delegates from the societies in England experienced at Paris, was the best proof of the real intention of the French government. Though the numbers of these clubs had been deemed too contemptible for the animadversion of the law, or the notice of our

own executive government, they were considered enough for the National Convention, which chose to regard them as the clear, undisputed, constituted organ of the will of the people. What reliance could be placed on all their explanations, after the avowal of principles to the last degree dangerous to the liberty, the constitution, the independence, and the very existence of the country.

In further illustration of the real sentiments and designs of the French Rulers, a letter from one of them, MONGE, addressed to the friends of liberty, in the different sea-ports of France, and bearing date the 31st of December, 1792, only four days after a communication from Chauvelin to Lord Grenville, in which that same council had complained that a harsh construction had been put, by the British Ministry, on the conduct of France, and, at the same time, professed the strongest friendship for Great Britain, was read by Mr. Pitt.—In this letter England and Spain were represented as two *tyrannical* governments, which, after *persecuting the patriots* in their own territories, thought they should be able to influence the judgment to be pronounced on *the tyrant Louis*.—But the people of France would not suffer laws to be dictated to them by a tyrant.—"The King and his Parliament mean to make war against us! *Will the English*

Republicans suffer it? Already these free men shew their discontent, and the repugnance which they have to bear arms against their brothers, the French. Well! we will fly to their succour; we will make a descent on the island; we will lodge there fifty thousand caps of liberty; we will plant there the sacred tree, and we will stretch out our arms to our republican brethren; *the tyranny of their government will soon be destroyed.*—Let every one of us be strongly impressed with this idea."

Such was the declaration of the sentiments of the Minister of the Marine; a declaration which separated not only the King, but the King and Parliament, from the people, who were called republicans. What faith could be put in assurances, given on the part of France by Chauvelin, on the 27th of December, when, in four days after, a member of the French government was found writing such a letter? It was highly proper, therefore, to reject such explanations as those which had been offered only to deceive. The state of the negotiation, then, appeared to be this,—the conduct of France was inconsistent with the peace and liberty of Europe; the French had given no satisfaction with respect to the question at issue; they had, indeed, offered what they called explanations,—but their principles, and the whole tenour of

their conduct were such, that no faith could be put in their declarations.—Their conduct gave the lie to their public professions; and, instead of giving satisfaction on the distinct articles, on which we had a right to claim a clear and precise explanation, and instead of shewing any desire to abandon those views of conquest and aggrandizement, to return within their ancient limits, and to set barriers to the progress of their destructive arms, and to their principles, still more destructive; instead of doing this, they had, by way of explanation, avowed their determination to persist in those practices which constituted the very ground of complaint.

If France was really desirous of maintaining friendship and peace with England, she must shew herself disposed to renounce her views of aggression and aggrandizement, and to confine herself within her own territory, without insulting other governments, without disturbing their tranquillity, without violating their rights. Unless she consented to these terms, whatever might be the wishes of the British nation for peace, the final issue must be war.— But, as to the time, as to the moment when the war was to commence, if there were yet any possibility of satisfactory explanation, and security for the future, it was not to the last moment precluded. Mr. Pitt said, how-

ever, that he should disguise his sentiments to the House, if he stated, that he thought an accommodation in any degree probable. The country had always been desirous of peace; it was so still, but of such a peace as might be real and solid, and consistent with the interests and dignity of Britain, and with the general security of Europe. War, whenever it came, would be preferable to peace without honour, without security, and incompatible either with the external safety, or internal happiness, of the country.

Mr. Pitt, after he had fully developed his sentiments, on the important question at issue, moved an address, thanking his Majesty for his communication; offering him the heartfelt condolence of the House on the atrocious act lately perpetrated at Paris; expressing their sense of the aggressive and ambitious conduct of France; declaring their opinion of the necessity of a vigorous opposition to such conduct, and to the principles out of which it arose; and promising to make the necessary provision for a further augmentation of the national forces by sea and land.

The terms which Mr. Pitt here held out, as the condition of continued amity with France, were the same which were offered by Lord Grenville to Mr. Chauvelin, and were the

only terms to which Great Britain could, with honour, or even with safety, accede. They involved nothing which could affect either the character or the interest of France;—nothing with which any regular government, any nation, uninfluenced by aggressive and ambitious views, incompatible with the peace and independence of other countries, could refuse to comply.—Mr. Pitt had, at length, become fully sensible of the dangerous tendency of the destructive principles adopted and propagated by the French revolutionary government, when combined with the means of aggression which that government possessed, and with the fixed resolution to employ them, avowed in their public acts, and manifested in their public conduct. It was strange, indeed, that a mind so acute as his, and so accustomed to follow causes to their consequences, should have been so long blind to the effects of such a comprehensive system of universal disorganization; which was not limited to one or two nations, but included, within its spacious grasp, all civil and civilized society. Had he been fully sensible of these effects, at an earlier period of the revolution, had he firmly resolved to check the growing spirit of mischief ere it had attained to its present state of maturity, and had he acted in concert with Russia and Prussia, when they

first engaged in the contest, it is more than probable that he would have succeeded in the accomplishment of his end, with comparative facility. But it is by no means clear, that he would then have met with that support in Parliament, and in the country, which he now experienced. The minds of men were not then so alive to the danger which threatened Europe from the propagation of those vile principles; and it would have been infinitely more difficult to persuade them, that they were calculated to produce the effects which had now been *seen* to flow from them. Mr. Pitt, too, had a strong, and a very natural, bias in favour of peace. His plans of financial reform, his projects for the improvement of the revenue, and his scheme for the gradual reduction of the national debt, all required the continuance of peace to give them their full effect. His favourite objects thus tended to strengthen his pacific prepossessions, and to increase his disinclination to war. Nothing, then, but the fullest conviction of the formidable danger resulting from the conduct of the French government could have led him to propose, even now, those means of safety, and those preparations for resistance, which the situation of the country, and the state of Europe, so imperatively demanded. He was, indeed, forced, as it were,

to enter upon a system at variance with all his views of internal policy; to divert his attention from those peaceful pursuits which were most congenial to his disposition, his habits, and his studies; and to appear on the political stage, in a new and untried character.

Some discussion took place on the address proposed by Mr. Pitt, in which Mr. Fox declared his opinion of the non-existence of any danger to this country, and strongly deprecated a war. He took this opportunity, also, of attacking certain principles advanced by Mr. Burke, in his reflections on the French revolution. He did not scruple to assert, that the *People were the Sovereigns* in every state, but he did not condescend to explain who, in that case, were the *subjects*, although, without *subjects* there can be no *sovereigns*;—he further maintained the revolutionary doctrine, that the people had a right to change the form of their government, and to cashier their governors for misconduct, as the people of this country had cashiered James the Second; *not by a Parliament, or any regular form known to the Constitution*, but by a convention, speaking the sense of the people;* that convention produced

* Mr. Fox should have here confined himself to a statement of the mere fact, that James had been deposed

a Parliament and a King. They elected William to a vacant throne, not only setting aside James, whom they had justly cashiered for misconduct, but even his innocent son. Again, they elected the House of Brunswick, not individually, but by dynasty, and that dynasty to continue while the terms and conditions, on which it was elected, are fulfilled, and no longer. He could not admit the right to do all this but by acknowledging *the sovereignty of the people as paramount to all other laws.**

Whatever might be the intentions of the Speaker, this speech could not fail to encourage the seditious societies in England, to continue their efforts for the subversion of the constitution, and to express their wishes for the success of the French, since it justified the fundamental principle of the French revolution, from which the practice of the French rulers might easily be defended as a natural deduction. The facts, too, of the English revolution were misrepre-

(or declared to have abdicated the throne) by a convention; without adding that for which he had no authority,---that the convention *spoke the sense of the people.* The addition might be necessary to his argument, but it wanted the sanction of History.

* Debrett's Parliamentary Debates for 1793. p. 417, 418.

sented, its nature and object perverted, and its leading principles artfully concealed. Mr. Windham answered Mr. Fox, contradicting his assertions respecting the sovereignty of the people;—after which the address was carried without a division.

The sincerity of Mr. Pitt's declarations of the wish of the British cabinet to preserve peace, was fully proved by his conduct, from the first dawn of the French revolution to the present moment. From the middle of the year 1791, upon the first rumour of any measure taken by the Emperor of Germany, and till late in the year 1792; not only were the British ministers no parties to any of the projects imputed to the Emperor, but, from the political circumstances, in which they then stood with relation to the Court of Vienna, they wholly declined all communication with him on the subject of France. To Prussia, who was the ally of Great Britain, and still more decisively to Holland, with whom the British government were in close and intimate correspondence, they uniformly stated their unalterable resolution to maintain neutrality, and to avoid interference in the internal affairs of France, so long as France should refrain from hostile measures against England and her allies. No minister of England had any authority to treat with

foreign states, even provisionally, for any warlike contest, till after the battle of Gemappe, which was fought on the 6th of November, 1792; till a period subsequent to the repeated provocations which had been offered to this country, and subsequent, particularly, to the disorganizing decree of the 19th of November.*

Even then, Mr. Pitt laboured to devise means for preventing a war. Mr. Maret (the present Secretary to Buonapartè) was, at this time, in England; and Mr. Pitt held a personal conference with him, on the subject of the existing grounds of difference between the two countries. The particulars of this conference were communicated to the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, by Mr. Maret, on the Second of December, and his letter was afterwards published by the French government. By this document it appears, that Mr. Pitt gave the strongest assurances of his sincere desire to avoid a war, and explained the conditions on which it might be avoided, which conditions were similar to those which he explained to the House of Commons, and which were communicated, by Lord Grenville, to Chauvelin. He

* See Mr. Pitt's Speech on the 3d of February, 1800, in the collection of his speeches, by Mr. Hathaway. Vol. IV.

told Maret, that if the French government would authorize any person to treat with the British Ministers, they would find them disposed to listen to him, and to behave with cordiality and confidence. He requested Maret not to reject the only means of bringing them together, and of making them understand each other, when every question, proposed by the French government, should be examined, and every proposition considered. He urged him not to lose a moment in sending to Paris for instructions, and to let him know the instant they arrived, when he would communicate with him on the subject. Mr. Maret, in his letter to the Minister, expresses his conviction of the sincerity of Mr. Pitt's pacific professions, and even says—"Mr. Pitt dreads war even more than the aristocracy of opposition." Talleyrand, the apostate Bishop of Autun, was in London at the same time, (in December, 1792) and informed the French government, that the British Ministry "had nothing more at heart than to treat for the preservation of their neutrality."

At this period, Russia had, at length, conceived, as well as the English government, a natural and a just alarm for the balance of Europe, and applied to our Ministers to learn their sentiments on the subject. In their answer to this application, the Ministers imparted to

Russia the principles upon which they acted, and this answer was communicated to Prussia, between whom and this country a treaty of defensive alliance now subsisted. A dispatch was sent, from Lord Grenville, to the British Minister at St. Petersburgh, dated December the 29th, stating a desire to have an explanation set on foot on the subject of the war with France. It was here observed, that the two leading points on which the explanation would naturally turn, were the line of conduct to be followed previous to the commencement of hostilities, and, *with a view, if possible, to avert them*; and the nature and amount of the forces which the powers engaged in this concert might be enabled to use, supposing such extremities unavoidable. With respect to the first, it appeared on the whole, subject, however, to future consideration and discussion with the other powers, that the most advisable step to be taken would be, that sufficient explanation should be had with the powers at war with France, in order to enable those not hitherto engaged in the war, to propose to that country terms of peace.—That these terms should be, the withdrawing their armies within the limits of the French territory; the abandoning their conquests; the rescinding any acts injurious to the sovereignty or rights of any other nations;

and the giving, in some public and unequivocal manner, a pledge of their intention no longer to foment troubles, or to excite disturbances against other governments. In return for these stipulations, the different powers of Europe, who should be parties to this measure, might engage to abandon all measures or views of hostility against France, or interference in their internal affairs, and to maintain a correspondence, and intercourse of amity, with the existing powers in that country, with whom such a treaty might be concluded. If, in the result of this proposal so made, by the powers acting in concert, these terms should not be accepted by France, or, being accepted, should not be satisfactorily performed, the different powers might then engage themselves to each other, to enter into active measures, for the purpose of obtaining the ends in view; and it might be considered, whether, in such case, they might not rationally look to some indemnity for the expenses and hazards to which they would necessarily be exposed.

It was not possible for any person, the most anxious to avoid hostilities, to conceive any measure to be adopted, in the actual situation of affairs, more strongly demonstrative of an earnest desire, after repeated provocations, to preserve peace, on any terms in the least

degree consistent with national safety; nor could any sentiment be suggested more plainly and directly indicative of moderation, forbearance, and sincerity. Indeed, it is no longer a doubt, that this spirit of forbearance was carried much too far, and that an earlier display of that spirit of vigour and decision, manifested in open and determined hostility, which was alone adequate to meet and to repel the impending danger, would have been more wise, more politic, and more safe. Mr. Pitt himself acknowledged, at a subsequent period, with that candour which formed so prominent a feature in his character, that, at this time, he had not rightly cast the true character of the French revolution, and he could not deny that he should have been better justified in a very different conduct. On that occasion, he confessed, adverting to this very time, that the ministers had been too slow in anticipating that danger of which they had, perhaps, even then, sufficient experience; and might have seen that nothing but vigorous and open hostility could afford complete and adequate security against revolutionary principles, while they retained a portion of power sufficient to furnish the means of war.*

* Speech of February 3d, 1800.

Nor did Mr. Pitt's efforts to avert a war stop even here.—Fully apprized of the resolution of the French government to invade Holland, at all events, the British Cabinet had transmitted the most positive instructions to Lord Auckland, our ambassador at the Hague, to render the Dutch sensible of the impending danger, and to induce them to adopt every requisite means of preparation and defence. In the accomplishment of this task, his Lordship was most zealously assisted by the Grand Pensionary, Von-Spieghel, a man of strict integrity, and of considerable talents. At this time, active negotiations were carried on between the Courts of St. James's, Vienna, Berlin, and St. Petersburgh, with a view to a general concert, in case every previous attempt to restore peace on the Continent, on a permanent footing, should prove abortive.—But *peace* was the primary object of every effort of the British Minister, as it was the first wish of his heart. M. de Maulde Hosdan, who had been a colonel in the French army, and who was a man of insinuating manners, and of no mean ability, was the French Minister at the Hague at this critical period; which residence he had left on the Second of January, 1793, to repair to Paris. General Dumouriez, having obtained leave of absence, from the army in the Netherlands, had

also repaired to that capital. Two motives were assigned, as the objects of the General's journey.—First, to make a final arrangement with the Executive Council, for the execution of his plan for the invasion of Holland;—and, secondly, to exert his influence for the purpose of saving the life of his unfortunate Sovereign. It is highly probable that he had both these objects in view, though, in the accomplishment of one, his success was but partial, while, in that of the other, the failure was complete.

On the 27th of January, M. Joubert, M. de Maulde's Secretary, arrived at the Hague from Paris, and delivered a verbal message to Lord Auckland, purporting that General Dumouriez was gone to Ghent to resume the command of the army, and had given a letter to M. de Maulde, who would reach the Hague in a few hours, and wished to be received at the Ambassador's Hotel with as much secrecy as possible.—Accordingly, late in the evening, M. de Maulde arrived.—At this interview, Lord Auckland, very naturally, expressed his repugnance to engage in any conference or communication with the agents of an usurped government, stained with recent and complicated crimes of the worst description. But the explanations, afforded by M. de Maulde, respecting the sentiments and views of Dumouriez, were

such as to induce his Lordship to receive the letter, which solicited an interview, either with his Lordship alone, or with his Lordship and M. Von Spieghel, and expressed a hope that the result would be favourable to England, to the United Provinces, to France, to Humanity, and to all Europe.* Immediately after the perusal of this letter, Lord Auckland sent a message to London, to refer its contents to his Majesty's Ministers, and to solicit instructions on a proposition of such serious importance.

There was every reason to believe, that Dumouriez was sincere in this overture, and that his intentions were pacific and honourable. The British Cabinet was animated by similar feelings; and, though Mr. Pitt and Lord Grenville were not sanguine as to the result, they immediately transmitted to Lord Auckland the fullest instructions, and the fullest powers, for the proposed conference. At the same time, the preparations for war, both in England and in Holland, were redoubled, as it was much doubted whether Dumouriez could possess the means of carrying his intentions into effect, or of eventually doing any real good with such a government as that under which he acted.

* See Appendix C, for the original letter.

So earnest, however, was the desire to adopt every expedient for the preservation of peace, that, even the declaration of war, by the French Convention, on the first of February, against England and Holland, in consequence of a report made by Brissot, was not suffered to operate as an obstruction to the conference demanded by Dumouriez. On the eighth of February, Lord Auckland addressed a letter to that officer, for the purpose of settling the time and place of meeting, and of explaining the principles and views by which his Sovereign had been actuated in authorising his Lordship to confer with the General. It was truly observed, that the King had been influenced *by his unalterable love of peace*, by his humanity, by his desire to concert efficacious means, with the other powers of Europe, for the re-establishment of general tranquillity, on a solid, just, and satisfactory, foundation; by views of beneficence towards individuals, as well as by principles calculated to promote the happiness of all nations. His Lordship adverted to the aggressive acts of the French government, particularly the declaration of war, since the conference was first proposed, which would have fully justified him in adopting a different line of conduct, but declared that he should ever be ready to meet, and to discuss any

proposition which had for its object the good of the two countries. It was ultimately agreed that the interview between the British Ambassador, the Grand Pensionary of Holland, and the French Commander, should take place in the Mardych, on board a yacht belongi[redacted] the Prince of Orange, which was in rea[redacted] for the purpose.—But, on the 14th of Fe[redacted] M. Joubert arrived at the Hague, with[redacted] to Lord [redacted]ckland, dated the 12th, from[redacted] Maulde, [redacted]orming his lordship, that [redacted] riez had received orders from the Con[redacted] not to hold the proposed conference.—"[redacted] *trevue n'aura pas lieu. Mon Souverain en* [redacted] *autrement. Je ne puis que me resigner* [redacted] *taire.*" So little anxious were the re[redacted]ics, who had usurped the reins of gove[redacted]ment, to preserve peace with the neigh[redacted]ouring powers.

Were any further evidence nece[redacted]sary to prove the pacific disposition of the British Minister, and the aggressive spirit of the French executive council, it might be collected from the repeated confessions of the respective leaders of the different revolutionary parties in France, each of whom, at different times, accused the others of being the authors of the war, not only against Great Britain and Hol-

land, but against Austria and Prussia;—thus affording the strongest of all proofs, and the best possible testimony, that the war, on the part of England, was sanctioned by principles of justice, of necessity, and of self-preservation.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Royal Message communicating to Parliament the French declaration of war—Debates thereon—Mr. Pitt's Speech—His proofs of British neutrality and of French aggression—Established by authentic documents—Animadversions on the French Manifesto—Its falsehood demonstrated—Its various charges examined and confuted—The French Government guilty of the very acts with the commission of which they reproached the English Government—Mr. Pitt's arguments supported and confirmed by the authority of French writers—Efforts of the French Government to produce an artificial scarcity in England, and to create Rebellion in this Country—Gold and silver purchased with assignats in England and exported to France—Mr. Pitt moves an address to the King, promising support—Mr. Fox objects to some parts of it—Insists that no specific demand of reparation had been urged by Ministers—Accuses Ministers of an eagerness for war—Moves an Amendment—Mr. Fox's charges against Ministers shewn to be groundless—Chauvelin's dismissal justified from his boasted intimacy with the leaders of the British opposition—Resolution of the French Regicides to exterminate all Monarchs, and to annihilate Monarchy—Mr. Dundas answers Mr. Fox, and proves that specific means for preventing a war had been suggested by the

British Cabinet—Mr. Burke ridicules the notions of Mr. Fox—Amendment rejected, and Address carried, without a division—Debate on the same subject in the House of Lords—Lord Lauderdale's boasted friendship for Brissot truly characterized by Lord Loughborough—The opposition seem to derive confidence from the diminution of their numbers—They resolve to harass the government by repeated motions for Peace—Mr. Fox moves a string of resolutions—His Speech in support of them—Censures Ministers and justifies France—Memorial presented by Lord Auckland to the States General of Holland—Reprobated by Mr. Fox—Misrepresentations of Mr. Fox corrected—Object and tendency of his resolutions, inferred from his past conduct, and from his known intimacy with M. Chauvelin—Mr. Burke affirms that all the sentiments in Mr. Fox's Speech had already appeared in the French papers as sentiments *that would be offered* to the House of Commons—His comments on Mr. Fox's constant defence of the French government—Marks the base ingratitude of Chauvelin—Mr. Fox's resolutions rejected by a majority of two hundred and seventy-four—Mr. Grey moves resolutions similar to those of Mr. Fox—They are rejected without a division, and without a debate—Discussion on the proposal for the erection of Barracks—The system censured by Mr. Taylor and Mr. Fox—Defended by Mr. Pitt—Proofs of attempts to seduce the Army from their duty—Mr. Dundas's statement of Indian affairs—Prosperity of that Country—Mr. Sheridan's motion for an inquiry into the existence of seditious practices—Opposed by Mr. Windham—Mr. Fox avows his disbelief of plots and conspiracies—Is answered by Mr. Burke—Motion negatived without a division—Mr. Pitt opens the Budget—Ways and Means—The House concurs in his proposed resolutions—Bill for preventing traitorous correspondence brought in by the Attorney-General—Objects of the Bill—

Attacked by Mr. Fox—Supported by Mr. Martin, Mr' Frederick North, and Mr. Burke—Bill carried by a great majority—Discussed in the House of Lords—Opposed by the Duke of Norfolk, the Marquis of Lansdowne, and the Earls of Guildford, Lauderdale, and Stanhope—Passes into a Law.

[1793.] The declaration of war, issued by the French government against England and Holland, was formally communicated to Parliament. The two Houses were informed that the persons then exercising the powers of government in France, had, without previous notice, and, on the most groundless pretences, directed acts of hostility to be committed against this country and the United Provinces; that, under the circumstances of this wanton and unprovoked aggression, his Majesty had taken the necessary steps to maintain the honour of the Crown, and to vindicate the rights of his people; that he relied, with confidence, on the firm and effectual support of Parliament, and on the zealous exertions of a brave and loyal people, in prosecuting a just and necessary war, and in endeavouring, under the blessing of Providence, to oppose an effectual barrier to the further progress of a system which struck at the security and peace of all independent nations, and was pursued in open

defiance of every principle of moderation, good faith, humanity, and justice. His Majesty stated, in this message, that he had every reason to hope, in a cause of such general concern, for the cordial co-operation of those powers who were united with him by the ties of alliance, or who felt an interest in preventing the extension of anarchy and confusion, and in contributing to the security and tranquillity of Europe.

The royal message was taken into consideration by the House of Commons, on the 12th of February, when Mr. Pitt enlarged on the topics which had been discussed in the late debate, and entered into further proofs of the aggressive and dangerous conduct of the French government. It was no longer, he contended, a subject of speculation or opinion, whether, and on what terms, we should secure the continuance of an unsafe and precarious peace.—War had been declared against us, and was carried on at our very doors;—a war which aimed at an object of no less magnitude than the destruction of the freedom and independence of the country; nothing, therefore, was left but to oppose the efforts of our enemies, with adequate vigour and effect. He again proved, that his Majesty had observed the

strictest and most inviolable neutrality towards France; and that, in return, the French rulers had expressly engaged to respect the rights of his Majesty, and of his allies, not to interfere in the government of any neutral country, and not to pursue any system of aggrandizement, or make any addition to their dominions, but to confine themselves, at the conclusion of the war, within their own territories. All these conditions they had grossly violated, and had adopted an ambitious and destructive system of policy, fatal to the peace and security of every government; and which, in its consequences, had shaken Europe itself to its foundation. Their decree of the 19th of November, which had been so much discussed, offering fraternity and assistance to all people who wished to recover their liberty, was a decree not levelled against particular nations, but against every country where there was any form of government established;—a decree not hostile to individuals, but to the human race; which was calculated every where to sow the seeds of rebellion and civil contention, and to spread war from one end of Europe to the other,—from one end of the Globe to the other.—So far from exempting England from the operation of this decree, it might be sup-

posed that it was its particular object,* if an opinion were to be formed from the exultation with which the French Rulers had received, from different societies in England, every address expressive of sedition and disloyalty, and from the eager desire which they had testified to encourage and cherish the growth of such sentiments. Not only had they shewn no inclination to fulfil their engagements, but they had even put it out of their own power, by taking the first opportunity to make additions to their

* So true is it that there was no intention to exempt England from the operation of this outrageous decree, that, after the complaints of the British government respecting it were known in France, a motion made in the Convention, on the 24th of Dec. by Mr. BARAILLON, for the purpose of limiting its application to powers with whom the French were actually at war, was rejected without a division. The following brief account of this attempt is extracted from the Moniteur, of Dec. 25, 1792. *Baraillon.*—"This decree has already made us "many enemies;—and the number will still be increased. "The English Ministry have testified their discontent to our "government, who have been forced to give the most favour- "able interpretation to the decree. I move that in the decree "of Nov. 19th, after these words, 'The National Conven- "'tion declares, in the name of the French nation, that they "'will grant fraternity and assistance to all people,' the fol- "lowing words be added, 'Against those tyrants with whom "'they shall be at war.'"

"The previous question was moved on this amendment. "It was decreed that *there was no ground for deliberation.*"

territory in contradiction to their own direct stipulations. By express resolutions for the destruction of the existing government of all invaded countries, by the means of jacobin societies, by orders given to their generals, by the whole system adopted in this respect by the National Convention, and by the actual annexation of the whole country of Savoy, they had marked their determination to enlarge the dominions of France, and to provide means, by new conquests, to extend their principles over the whole of Europe. Their conduct was such as, in every instance, militated against the dearest and most valuable interests of this country.

Mr. Pitt then specified all the means and precautions which had been adopted by the Ministers for preventing a war:* these, indeed, were but too evident, and it is needless to repeat them. In spite of these war had been declared by the French, and an embargo had been laid

* Both Dumouriez, in his Memoirs, and Brissot, in his memorable letter to his constituents, do justice to the pacific intentions of the British Minister; the former expressly says, that *war might easily have been avoided* by the French government; and the latter, though the author of the declaration of war, ascribes all the disastrous events, which he affected to deplore, after he had actively contributed to promote them, to the impolicy of provoking a war with England.

upon all the vessels and persons of his Majesty's subjects, without any previous notice, contrary to treaty, and against all the laws of nations.—Yet, it was after this outrageous act, that Lord Auckland had been authorized to confer with Dumouriez on the terms of accomodation. He now proceeded to animadvert on the French Manifesto, which contained the reasons, or rather the pretexts, for the declaration of war: it began with declaring, "That the King of England had not ceased, especially since the revolution of the 10th of August, 1792, to give proofs of his being evil-disposed towards the French nation, and of his attachment to the coalition of crowned heads!" No attempt was made to support this assertion, by shewing any acts of hostility previous to the 10th of August; nor was any fact adduced to prove the alleged attachment to the coalition, except the King's supposed accession to the treaty between the Emperor of Germany and the King of Prussia. But there was no truth whatever in the supposition; it was utterly destitute of foundation; no accession having ever taken place, on the part of his Majesty, to any such treaty.

The next charge was, "That at the period aforesaid, he ordered his ambassador, at Paris, to withdraw, because he would not acknowledge the provisional Executive Council, created

by the Legislative Assembly." As the ambassador was accredited to the King only, when the King was deposed, and the atrocities of the 10th of August, and those of the 2d of September had occurred, it became necessary to recal him; his recal, too, at the time, had not been made a subject of complaint. It was then urged, "That the cabinet of St. James's had ceased, since the same period, to correspond with the French ambassador at London, on pretext of the suspension of the heretofore King of the French. That, since the opening of the National Convention, it had refused to resume the usual correspondence between the two States, and to acknowledge the powers of this Convention. That it had refused to acknowledge the ambassador of the French Republic, although provided with letters of credence in its name." Chauvelin had been received as the ambassador of Louis the XVI. and when that Monarch was deposed, the powers of his ambassador ceased, of course. The letters of credence from the usurpers of the regal authority were not presented till the seventeenth of January; after the revolutionary decree of November had been passed, after the preliminary steps for the murder of the King had been adopted, after repeated instances of aggression and offence had occurred;—it was impossible, therefore, to receive them, and

thereby to acknowledge the Convention, whose assumed authority was thus cruelly and unjustly exercised against the power which they had usurped.

Having expatiated at some length upon these points, he proceeded to examine the validity of the next charges, of forbidding the exportation of grain, and other commodities, to France,*

* The bills for prohibiting the exportation of corn, and of arms, to France, were brought into the British Parliament in the month of December; the obvious necessity of such a prohibition, after the hostile disposition of the French had been so fully, and so repeatedly, manifested, renders all argument in defence of it superfluous. France herself had passed a decree for prohibiting the exportation of arms and ammunition, on the third of November, 1791; and England was not so weak, or so querulous, as to make it a subject of complaint. The bill for prohibiting the exportation of corn, which Chauvelin had the assurance to call "An act of perfidy," had been rendered indispensably necessary, by the more than suspicious conduct of the French government. For, although there was plenty of wheat in France, at that period, the Minister for the Home Department, as appears by a report from the Committee of Subsistence, on Nov. 29th, 1792, and inserted in the *Moniteur*, of the first of December following, purchased corn, at the beginning of December, in England, at a much higher price than it sold for in the French market. In the sitting of the Convention, of the 6th of December, Marat reproached the Minister with this fact, and declared, that a respectable citizen had offered to procure any quantity of corn at *twenty-seven livres*, the *septier*, while he was paying at the rate of *fifty-four livres* for it in the English ports. This fact is stated in the

and obstructing the commercial operations of the Republic in England, by prohibiting the circulation of assignats;* of subjecting French

Moniteur of the 8th of December. It was, therefore, perfectly clear that, in this conduct, the French government had some sinister views; and, as an *artificial scarcity* had been one of the principal revolutionary instruments, in the early periods of the revolution, it is not too much to suppose, that the intention was to produce similar effects in this country by the creation of a real scarcity. Brissot, indeed, says, in his letter to his constituents, that "We might have cut off the means of subsistence from our enemies, by harassing their commerce, and *have excited internal commotions by the scarcity and dearness of provisions.*"

* The bill for prohibiting the circulation of *assignats*, in England, was brought into the House of Commons by the Attorney-general, on the 26th of December, and passed both Houses in a few days, with little opposition. This bill, the object of which was to forbid both the payment and the tender of French assignats, was equally necessary with the other measures of precaution and safety, adopted by the British government, at this critical period.—For, besides the immense loss which must have been sustained by individuals, from the circulation of revolutionary instruments of fraud; it would have afforded the national convention the means of paying its agents in this country, and of promoting the popular insurrection, on the effect of which they placed the strongest reliance.—While Cambon had the direction of the committee of finance, assignats, to no less amount than three thousand millions of livres, were paid (according to Brissot) in eighteen months.—No inconsiderable quantity was transmitted to England, in November and December, 1792;—and there is the authority of Brissot for asserting, that Cambon bought in England, with

citizens to vexatious restrictions, by the Alien Act; of granting pecuniary aid to the *rebels*, and of receiving the rebel chiefs from the West Indies. All these had been stated as provocations. That we had, indeed, taken measures, which, if viewed by themselves, and not as

assignats, specie to the amount of twenty-five millions of livres, or about a million and fifty thousand pounds sterling.--- This sum was never accounted for, and there is every reason to believe that it was employed for the purpose of gaining partisans to France, with a view to promote a rebellion in England.* To this Brissot unquestionably refers, in the following passage of his letter to his constituents:—"These republicans have never ceased to assert, that, if we expect to "succeed, we must have *money for secret expenses*, partly for "the purpose of dividing the cabinet, and partly for the purpose *of exciting the people against their tyrants*. We want "it for the North, we want it for the South, we want it for "the Indies."—P. 74. Again,—"It was Cambon and Barrere, who caused the decree to be made, by which the "executive council was authorized to take, under the head "of army extraordinaries, *unlimited sums for secret operations*." By passing this salutary bill, then, the minister deprived the French government of one of the most powerful instruments for effecting the destruction of the English Constitution.

* Mr. Chalmers, in his valuable estimate of the comparative strength of Great Britain, proves that, in the year 1792, two millions nine hundred thousand ounces of silver were purchased, in this country, with assignats, and sent to France.

connected with the situation of affairs in which they were adopted, might possibly be considered in the light of provocations, was certain; but if those measures were justified by the necessity of circumstances, if they were called for by a regard to our own safety and interests, they could only be regarded as temperate and moderate precautions. And, in this point of view, these grounds, assigned in the declaration, could only be considered as frivolous and unfounded pretences. The charge respecting the exportation of grain was ridiculous; when there was reason to apprehend that France intended an attack upon the allies of this country, and against the country itself, was it natural to suppose that the English should furnish, from their own bosom, supplies to be turned against themselves and their allies? Could they be such children in understanding, could they be such traitors in principle, as to furnish to their enemies the means of hostility, and the instruments of offence? As to the prohibition of assignats, the French truly had reason to be offended that we would not receive what was worth nothing;—and that, by exercising an act which came completely within our own sovereignty, with respect to the circulation of any foreign paper currency, we avoided a gigantic system of swindling! If such, indeed, were the pretences which they

brought forward as grounds for a declaration of war, it was matter of wonder that, instead of a sheet of paper, they did not occupy a volume; but had proved, that their ingenuity had been exhausted before their modesty was at all affected. As to the effects of the Alien Bill, it was a measure of national safety, as it shielded us from the artifice of the seditious, and, perhaps, from the dagger of the assassin; and it ill became them to complain of it, who had adopted restrictions of police ten times more severe, but of which our government, however much its subjects might be affected by them, had never made the smallest complaint.*

* It has already been observed, that a measure of similar import to the Alien-bill, but more severe in its provisions and effects, had been passed in France, on the 18th of May, 1792. The decree here alluded to ordained, besides the oppressive restrictions before noticed, that every foreigner who should neglect to make the required declaration of his name, &c. should be fined an hundred livres, and subjected to imprisonment for any term not exceeding three months; and that whoever made a false declaration, should forfeit a thousand livres, and be imprisoned for any term not exceeding six months. Every Englishman who travelled in France, at that time, was obliged, before he could move from place to place, to provide himself with a passport, containing as exact a description of his age and person, as an advertisement for the apprehension of a thief. So strict was the examination of passports, on the different roads, that Lord Gower, when he returned from Paris, in

The Executive Council proceeded to state, 'That in the same spirit, without any provocation, and when all the maritime powers were at peace with England, the cabinet of St. James's had ordered a considerable naval armament,* and

August, 1792, was stopped more than once in his way, and detained till messengers had been sent to Paris, and returned with orders for his liberation. No complaints were made, by the English government, of this decree, which was a violation of the fourth article of the commercial treaty, because the French assembly declared it to be necessary for the preservation of internal tranquillity. At this time, too, it should be observed, the British government had, in no instance, deviated from the strictest neutrality; whereas, when the Alien-bill was introduced in the British Parliament, the national convention had publicly declared its readiness to assist in the subversion of the British Constitution. These facts suffice so show the extreme frivolity and injustice of the complaint preferred, on this account, by Mr. Le Brun.

* This naval armament, which now appeared so formidable to Mr. Le Brun, did not equal the number of ships which the French themselves had in commission. It has been seen, that only nine thousand seamen and marines, in addition to the sixteen thousand, the complement of the peace establishment, had been voted on the 20th of December; and no further addition was made till after the declaration of war by the French. These would not man more than eighteen sail of the line, with the proportionate number of smaller vessels, whereas it appears, from the report of the Minister of the Marine, on September 3d, 1792, that, even then, the French government had twenty-one sail of the line, thirty frigates, eighteen sloops, four and twenty cutters, and ten ships armed en flute, actually

an augmentation of the land forces.—That this armament was ordered at a moment when the English Minister was bitterly persecuting those

at sea; indeed, Brissot himself says, in his letter to his constituents, "England did not begin to arm *till three months after us.*" But there cannot be a better proof that the charge, respecting the armament, was nothing more than a miserable pretext, than the statement of the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, in his report to the convention, on the 19th of December, (inserted in the Moniteur of the 21st.) "*There "is nothing in these armaments which ought to alarm us,* "since they exceed only, by four sail of the line, the number "in commission in the preceding years; since, of the sixteen "ships now in commission, at least ten are guardships, the "oldest and the least serviceable vessels in the English navy; "and, lastly, since the King has declared, that these arma- "ments would require no additional taxes." And, on the 31st of the same month, when the British navy was increased, the same Minister acknowledged, that France had not much reason to be alarmed. Even on the 12th of January, 1793, Brissot considered the additional armament in England as exhibiting no serious demonstrations of a warlike intention, and as not exceeding the pretended armaments on former occasions, against Russia and against Spain; indeed, at that period, the French navy was more considerable than the British, the former having actually in commission, on the 13th of January, 1793, *fifty-four sail of the line,* whereas the latter had only *forty-five,* including those in commission, and, indeed, those only ordered to be put in commission. The truth then is, that all the acts of aggression were imputable, exclusively, to France, who had begun to increase her naval armaments, at a time when she acknowledged that the strictest neutrality had uniformly marked the conduct of England; whereas England did not begin to arm until she had the most positive proofs of the hostile inten-

who supported the principles of the French revolution in England, and was employing all possible means, both in Parliament and out of it, to cover the French Republic with ignominy, and to draw upon it the execration of the English nation and of all Europe."

This armament had taken place at the period when the French, by forcibly opening the navigation of the Scheldt, had shewn their intention to disregard the obligations of all treaties. When they had begun to propagate principles of universal war, and to discover views of unbounded conquests, was it to be wondered at, that, at such a time, we should think it necessary to take measures of precaution, and to oppose, with determination, the progress of principles, not only of so mischievous a tendency, but which, in their immediate consequences, threatened to be so fatal to ourselves and to our allies? If they meant to attack us because we did not like French principles, then would this, indeed, be that sort of war which had so often been alleged and deprecated by the opposition—a war against opinions.—If they meant to attack us because we loved our Consti-

tions of France. As to the land force, the whole amount of it in Great Britain, in December, 1792, was only 15,700 men; and not more than 1600 were added to it, previous to the declaration of war.

tution, then would it, indeed, be a war of extirpation; for, not till the spirit of Englishmen was exterminated, would their attachment to the Constitution be destroyed, and their generous efforts be slackened in its defence.

The French declaration then went on thus: "That the object of this armament, intended against France, was not even disguised in the English Parliament.

"That although the Provisional Executive Council of France had employed every measure for preserving peace and fraternity with the English nation, and had replied to calumnies and violations of treaties only by remonstrances, founded on the principles of justice, and expressed with the dignity of freemen, the English Minister has persevered in his system of malevolence and hostility, continued the armaments, and sent a squadron to the Scheldt to disturb the operations of the French in Belgium. That, on the news of the execution of Louis, he carried his outrages to the French Republic to such a length, as to order the ambassador of France to quit the British territory within eight days.

"That the King of England had manifested his attachment to the cause of *that traitor*, and his design of supporting it by different hostile resolutions adopted in his council

both by nominating generals of his land army, and by applying to Parliament for a considerable addition of land and sea forces, and putting ships of war in commission."

The French government clearly shewed their enmity to the British constitution, by taking every opportunity to separate the King of England from the nation, and by addressing the people as distinct from the government.—Upon the point of their fraternity, Mr. Pitt did not wish to say much; he had no desire for their affection.—Indeed, their fraternity was the greatest curse that could be inflicted on any people;—it went to deprive them of every means of subsistence, and to rob them of every consolation both here and hereafter. To the people of England they offered fraternity, while they would wrest from them that constitution by which they were protected, and deprive them of the numerous blessings which they enjoyed under its influence.—In that case, their fraternal embraces resembled those of certain animals who embraced only to destroy.

The grief which had been manifested by the British Court at the murder of Louis the Sixteenth, was, of all the reasons which had ever been urged for making war against another country, the most extraordinary;—they said they would make war on us, first, because we

loved our constitution; secondly, because we detested their proceedings; and, lastly, because we presumed to grieve at the death of their murdered King. Thus would they even destroy those principles of justice, and those sentiments of compassion, which led us to reprobate their crimes, and to be afflicted at their cruelties.—Thus would they deprive us of the last resource of humanity,—to mourn over the misfortunes and sufferings of the victims of their injustice. If such were the case, it might be asked, in the emphatic words of the Roman writer, *Quis gemitus Populo Romano libererit?* They would not only endeavour to destroy our political existence, and to deprive us of the privileges which we enjoyed under our excellent constitution, but they would eradicate our feelings as men; they would make crimes of those sympathies which were excited by the distresses of our common nature; they would repress our sighs, and restrain our tears.—Thus, except the specific fact, which was alleged as a ground of their declaration of war, namely, the accession of his Majesty to the treaty between Austria and Prussia, which was entirely false and unfounded, or the augmentation of our armament, a measure of precaution indispensably requisite for the safety of the country, and the protection of its allies, all the others were merely

unjust, unfounded, absurd, and frivolous, pretexts—pretexts which never could have been brought to justify a measure of which they were not, previously, strongly desirous, and which shewed that, instead of waiting for provocation, they only sought a pretence for aggression.—The death of Louis, though it only affected the individual, was aimed at all sovereignty, and shewed their determination to carry into execution that intention, which they had so often professed, of exterminating all monarchy.*

* The records of the debates of the French Legislative Assembly, and of the National Convention, the writings of public characters, and the manifestoes of the government, both previous and subsequent to the present period, all combine to supply a multiplicity of irrefragable proofs of the truth of this assertion. Brissot frequently confessed that "*the universal revolution of mankind*" was the object of himself and his associates in dethroning the King of France. "*Before the tenth of August*, they wished for liberty, *not only for their own country, but* FOR ALL EUROPE!" Of course they wished for the extermination of all monarchy, and for the establishment of an universal republic. Publicola Chaussard, who was employed by the executive council, at the close of the year 1792, to carry their decrees of November 19th, and December 15th, into effect in the Austrian Netherlands, and who received their particular instructions for the application of those decrees, declared their object in unequivocal terms.—"A WAR AD INTERNECIONEM *is declared between the republic and monarchies.*—Austria being once subdued, the Germanic body may become a

In conclusion, Mr. Pitt remarked, that we had, in every instance, observed the strictest neutrality, with respect to the French;—we had pushed, to its utmost extent, the system of

colossus of federative republics, and change the system of the North." The President of the Convention himself, in answer to an address from the sections of Paris, plainly told them, "This is *a war, to last till death*, between *republicans* and KINGS."---Robespierre avowed the object of the war to be "*The Revolution of Europe.*"---Camille Desmoulins, in his history of the Brissotins, affirms, what he calls "the *sublime* vocation of the Convention" to have been, "to create the French republic" (although, be it observed, they had solemnly sworn to support the *monarchical* constitution) "*to disorganize Europe*; perhaps *to purge it of its tyrants*, by the eruption of the volcanic principles of *equality*." But the most decisive of all these testimonies, is the evidence of the executive council themselves, who, in their instructions to their Commissioner, Chaussard, on the application of those very decrees which they represented as perfectly innocuous, observe, that peace cannot be obtained "BUT BY THE ANNIHILATION OF THE DESPOTS AND THEIR SATELLITES." Kings were publicly stigmatized as banditti, in the National Convention. ---- "All *Kings*," said Barbaroux, on the 8th of December, 1792, "only fight the people like a banditti." ---- And every effort was used, as well by the National Convention, as by the Jacobin Club, which partook of their power, and, not unfrequently, dictated their decisions, to inspire the people with an implacable hatred of kings, and with a ferocious desire to exterminate them from the face of the earth. On the fourth of September, the whole National Assembly, without a single exception, *swore hatred to Kings and to Royalty*, on the motion of Chabot, the monk, Grand Vicar to the Abbè Gregoire, one of

temperance and moderation; we had holden out the means of accommodation; we had waited till the last moment for satisfactory explanation. The means we had offered had

the most notorious criminals which the revolution engendered, who, ultimately, met his well-merited fate at the guillotine, after an ineffectual endeavour to poison himself.---This man offered himself as a volunteer in the corps of twelve hundred Regicides, which Jean de Brie, soon after, proposed to the Convention to establish. On the 28th of November, the Abbè Gregoire, who was then President of the Convention, said, in answer to an address from one of the seditious clubs in England, "*Principles* are waging war *against Royalty*, which will fall under the blows of philosophy. Royalty, in Europe, is either destroyed, or in the last agony, perishing on the ruins of the feudal system; and the declaration of rights, placed by the side of thrones, is a devouring fire, which will soon consume them. Estimable republicans, console yourselves with the reflection, that the festival which you have celebrated in honour of the French revolution, *is the prelude to the festival of nations*."

Remi, a member of the Convention, conjured his brethren, on the second of December, to "*teach the people to punish their tyrants in a manner worthy of themselves*;" and, on the fourth of that month, the noted Carra told the Convention---"You know that the stroke, by which the head of Louis is about to fall, *will make the heads of the other despots totter*."---In the same spirit, Carra, in his speech of the second of January, said---"Let the head of Louis fall; and *George the Third, with his Minister, Pitt, will feel if their heads are still on their shoulders.---The same fate will attend the other despots*; and shortly will every people exclaim, "the head of our tyrant is not more divine than that of Louis;

been slighted and abused; and not the smallest disposition had been evinced to afford the explanation required. They had, at last, proceeded to direct acts of hostility, by seizing our vessels in our very ports, without any provocation on our part; and they had declared, and were now waging, war, without any other preparation by us, than those of necessary precaution. Such was the conduct which they had pursued,—such was the situation in which we stood. It now remained to be seen whether, under Providence, the efforts of a free, brave, loyal, and happy people, aided by their allies, would not be successful in checking the progress of a system, the principles of which, if not opposed, threatened the most fatal consequences to the tranquillity of the country, the security of its allies, the good order of every European government, and the happiness of the whole human race.

let us strike it off, therefore; let us abolish royalty; let us imitate the French in every thing; and cries of Vive la liberté! Vive l'Egalité! Vive la republique! shall resound throughout Europe."

After this notable exhortation to murder, *for the sake of the example*, and only two days before the declaration of war, Danton said, in the Convention, "You have thrown down the gauntlet to Kings;---this gauntlet is the head of a King;--- *it is the signal of their approaching death.*"

The address moved by Mr. Pitt, repeating, as usual, the sentiments contained in the message, was seconded by Mr. Powis. Mr. Fox objected to some parts of it;—he contended, that no supposed insult or aggression could supply a just ground of war, unless satisfaction had been specifically demanded and refused. He allowed the decree of the 19th of November entitled the country to require an explanation; but he contended, that no explanation, sufficiently clear, specific, and definite, had been demanded.—He insisted that, from the very first, we had never discovered any sincere desire to negotiate.—And he considered the recal of our ambassador from Paris, and the dismissal of Chauvelin, as sufficient proofs of the justice of this assertion. He reproached ministers as acting like men afraid of seeking complete satisfaction, lest it should be granted; of stating the specific causes of complaint, lest they should lose their pretext for war.* It was a natural deduction from these false premises, that the war was imputable to the mismanagement of ministers; and, therefore, he could not support that part of the address which represented it as an unprovoked aggression on the part of France. He was persuaded that the dismission of Chauvelin, and the prohibition of the exportation of corn to that country, when

it was allowed to others, were acts of provocation and hostility on our part. In pursuance of these sentiments, Mr. Fox moved an amendment to the address, expressing the concern of the House, that the Assembly, who now exercised the powers of government in France, had directed the commission of hostility against the persons and property of his Majesty's subjects, and that they had since actually declared war against his Majesty and the United Provinces; then, pledging the support of the House, in repelling every hostile attempt against this country, and in such other exertions as might be necessary to induce France to consent to such terms of pacification as might be consistent with the honour of his Majesty's Crown, the security of his allies, and the interests of his people.

The insufficiency of the reasons assigned by Mr. Fox for throwing the blame of the war on the British Ministers, has been already demonstrated in the course of this discussion. —But it is fortunate for the historian that a document exists to prove that the dismission of Chauvelin could not be considered by the French government, notwithstanding their public declarations, as an act of aggression on our part, since they had themselves actually issued orders for his recal, *before* Lord Grenville's order was

sent to Chauvelin, to leave the kingdom. This last order was dated the *twenty-fourth* of January; and in a letter, written by Dumouriez to Miranda, dated Paris, January the *twenty-third*, it is expressly stated, that orders had been already given to Chauvelin to return.—"*On a donnè ordre à notre ambassadeur Chauvelin de revenir.*"* It is perfectly clear, therefore, that the war could not have been occasioned by the conduct of our Ministers, in the dismission of Chauvelin. It was still in the power of the French government to continue the negotiations, through any other channel, and, indeed, it is evident, from the conversation between Mr. Pitt and Mr. Maret, before adverted to, that the British Minister was most anxious for the preservation of peace, and that his anxiety betrayed him into a species of condescension scarcely compatible with the dignity of his situation, and led him even to *court*, and to *solicit*, the proposal of such means, on the part of France, for the prevention of a war, as he could accede to, consistently with his duty, and without compromising the honour and the security of the country.

But, independently of these prominent and commanding motives, (already detailed) which

* Correspondence du General Miranda. P. 15.

rendered necessary the dismissal of a man, who had been accredited by a Monarch, now recently murdered, and who had, without a scruple, transferred his allegiance and his services to the assassins of his lawful Sovereign; there were subordinate motives, arising out of the personal character and conduct of the individual, alone sufficient to justify the act.—Mr. Chauvelin had entered into that spirit of political proselytism, by the aid of which his new masters had succeeded in bringing their own Sovereign to the scaffold, and in placing the reins of government in the hands of his murderers, with all the alacrity and zeal of a new convert. In pursuance of those orders, which had been transmitted to all agents and emissaries of Republican France, accredited and unaccredited, he had made some efforts towards the execution of Le Brun's audacious threat, *to appeal from the King to the People.** He had,

* Le Brun, who was a member of the Executive Council, and Minister for Foreign Affairs, in his report to the Convention, of the 19th of December, 1792, affirmed, that express orders had been given to Chauvelin, "to embrace every opportunity of assuring the English *nation*, that, (notwithstanding the ill-humour of its *government*) the French people desired nothing more ardently, than to merit *its* esteem;" and Le Brun added, that if the naval armament (which, at the same time, he admitted ought not to occasion any alarm) should be continued, "*we would not fail to make a solemn appeal to the English nation.*"

indeed, after it was apparent that his Sovereign was a mere cypher in the State, and must speedily be dethroned, entered fully into the views of the republican faction. The tone of his official communications, and his irregular conduct, in seeking to address the Parliament, in a most unprecedented manner, and in violation both of the principles and of the forms of the British Constitution, all betrayed his ardent attachment to the new order of things, and his earnest wish to promote, as far as in him lay, the same divisions in this country which had tended, so materially, in France, to produce the total destruction of the political and social

Mr. Chauvelin's letter to Lord Grenville, of the 27th of December, contains a pointed allusion to the threatened appeal of Le Brun. This insolent republican there cautions the British Ministers "to consider the terrible responsibility of a declaration of war, (which had been previously resolved on by his own government) "which would incontestibly be their work; "the consequences of which must be fatal to both countries, "and to all mankind; and *in which a generous and free people "could not long consent to betray their own interests, by acting "as auxiliaries, and reinforcements, to a tyrannical coalition.*"--- The consequences of the war could not possibly be *fatal to all mankind*, unless it was the determination of France to make it a general war; and, indeed, Mr. Chauvelin's unguarded assertion could be founded only on his knowledge of the intentions of his new masters, (as afterwards avowed by one of them, *Brissot*) to *revolutionize all Europe*, by *setting fire to its four corners*.

edifice. He had early entered into a kind of confidential intercourse with the leaders of opposition in England, which was totally incompatible with the duty of a foreign Minister, and that connection continued to become more intimate and close until his final dismission. It appears, by a letter from Chauvelin to Chambonas, of the 17th of July, 1792, that he was in the habit of asking and of receiving the opinions of the opposition, on the conduct and intentions of Ministers;* and, when he was recalled, after the revolution of the tenth of August, he made a merit of this intercourse with the rebels, who deemed it of sufficient consequence to justify a revocation of their order of recal.—In his letter, on this occa-

* This letter, which may be seen in the *Moniteur* of July 29th, 1792, related to some alarms conceived by certain Frenchmen, lately arrived from the continent, relative to a small squadron of five sail of the line, which sailed from Portsmouth merely to perform naval evolutions in the channel. Chauvelin tells his government that there was no ground for such alarm; that his sentiments, on the subject, were the same as those of the English, "even of those who are the most jealous of the operations of government. *They have all been, and still are of opinion*, that the armament has no other object, than to exercise the English sailors in certain evolutions." He admitted, at this time, that these Frenchmen entertained "*certain false notions of the disposition of the English government.*"

sion, he observed, "*that though he did not stand* "*well with the English Minister, yet he stood* "*perfectly well with* MR. FOX, *and some other* "*members of opposition, and that* IT WOULD "NOT BE PRUDENT IN FRANCE TO LOSE THE "FRUITS OF HIS LABOURS WITH THOSE GEN-"TLEMEN, AND THEIR SUBSEQUENT SERVICES, "*for a vain form of diplomatic etiquette.*"* And, to such a length was this strange confidential intercourse carried, that, before the negotiation opened with the British Cabinet, he even communicated his secret instructions (in which it was positively stated, that the right of opening the Scheldt would not be abandoned, and that an acknowledgement of the French Republic would, nevertheless, be insisted on) to an intimate friend of Mr. Fox.† There can be no doubt, from the instructions and correspondence of Chauvelin, from all the circumstances of his case, and from the whole tenour of his conduct, that he was kept so long in London for the sole purpose of placing himself at the head of an insurrection, which he was directed to promote, and of the speedy occurrence of

* See this letter in the authentic correspondence with Le Brun and others, published by Mr. Miles. Appendix, P. 83.

† Idem. Ibid. P. 84.

which his employers entertained the fullest conviction. The only blame, then, which seems to attach to the British Ministers, for their conduct to this man, was for suffering him to remain in England after the Sovereign whom, alone, he represented had been dethroned, and after his language and his actions had manifested his unwarrantable designs.

Mr. Fox's amendment was opposed by Mr. Dundas, who, in answer to the assertion that no specific means of preventing a war had been suggested by the Ministers, referred the House to the letter of Lord Grenville to Chauvelin, in which his Lordship expressly stated, that, in order to secure the continuance of amity, France should renounce all views of aggrandizement, confine herself within her own territories, and desist from violating the rights of other nations. These certainly were distinct and specific terms, which were so intelligible and plain as to admit of neither misconception nor mistake.

Mr. Burke, too, opposed Mr. Fox's idea of the necessity of stating the specific object of war, previous to its commencement, declaring that he never heard, or read, of such a political maxim, either in theory or in practice. The first question to be considered, in such cases, was, whether there existed just grounds for a

war; and the second, how it was to be carried on with the greatest effect. — Previously to declare the means by which it was to be carried on, or to fix the precise period of its termination, was not only not consonant to general usage, but contrary to the accustomed policy of all nations.—The French had made no such declaration; and it would be highly impolitic and unwise in us, to cramp our operations, by any such unnecessary statement of our object.—The amendment was rejected, and the address carried, without a division.

In the discussion of the same subject in the House of Lords, a similar amendment to that moved by Mr. Fox, was proposed by Lord Lauderdale, and experienced the same fate.—In the debate on the King's first message, this nobleman took an opportunity of stating, that he was proud to rank Brissot* among the list of his friends, for his virtues and his talents.—This extraordinary statement, for extraordinary it must be considered, after Brissot had publicly proclaimed himself a rebel and a traitor, extorted

* Lord Lauderdale, on this occasion, quoted the sentiments of Brissot, to prove the *pacific disposition* of the French government, little thinking that, in a very short time, his friend would himself demonstrate the fallacy of such an assertion, and the injustice of such an inference.

from Lord Loughborough, who had recently been appointed Chancellor, the sarcastic remark, that, since friendships were founded on taste and sentiment,* he did not doubt that Lord Lauderdale's friendships were always formed on correct principles. As there was a taste in pictures, for objects in ruins, for desolated cities, shattered palaces, and prostrated temples, so might there be a similar taste in moral and political questions. To some minds, a people in a state of insurrection might be a sublime object; and to a mind heated with such a view, a more quiet and orderly course of events might appear dull and insipid.

It is perfectly natural, that confidence should be derived from a consciousness of strength; but the opposition, at this period, improving on the wisdom of experience, seemed to become confident in proportion as their numbers diminished, and their influence decreased. They had early resolved to oppose the war with France, just, necessary, and unavoidable, as it was, in every stage of its progress, and to suffer no opportunity to escape for pressing on the minds of Parliament, and of the country,

* *Id, in quo est* OMNIS VIS AMICITIÆ, *voluntatum, studiorum, sententiarum, summa consensio.* Cicero de Amicitiâ. Cap. IV.

the wisdom and the necessity of peace. They admitted, indeed, in their speeches, the propriety of supporting the war with vigour, but all their declarations and resolutions went to prove that it was neither politic nor just, and, consequently, to enfeeble its operations by directing the public opinion against it. By no means dismayed by the ill-success of his past efforts, Mr. Fox, on the eighteenth of February, again brought the question before the House.—On this occasion, he went over much of his old ground of argument, repeating his charge against Ministers, of having provoked the war by their conduct; again accusing them of insincerity in their negotiation, which he treated as a farce and a delusion; not an honest endeavour to preserve the blessings of peace, but a fraudulent expedient to throw dust in the eyes of the people of this country, in order that they might be hurried blindly into a war.—And, strange to say, he drew this inference from an attentive perusal of the correspondence between Lord Grenville and Mr. Chauvelin, which supply premises from which a directly opposite deduction must, it is conceived, be drawn by every cool and impartial mind. He also taxed the tone and language of the British Ministers with haughtiness, while he descried in the communications of the French government,

fraught as they were with fraud, perfidy, dissimulation, falsehood, and insolence, without a parallel in the annals of diplomacy, nothing to move his indignation, or to provoke his censures. His attacks were solely directed against the measures of the British Cabinet. A memorial which had been presented by Lord Auckland, on the 25th of January, to the States-General of Holland, he stigmatized as a paper which, for the contempt and ridicule it expressed of the French, stood unparalleled in diplomatic history; a paper, in which the whole of them, without distinction, who had been in the exercise of power since the commencement of the revolution, were styled a set of wretches, and loaded with other opprobrious terms.—It was called, a silly and insulting paper,* which, if

* Debrett's Parliamentary Debates, for 1793. P. 503,—et seq.---The following is the memorial to which Mr. Fox here adverted:

"Memorial presented by Lord Auckland, his Britannic Majesty's Minister at the Hague, to their High Mightinesses the States-General.

"High and Mighty Lords,

"The undersigned, Ambassador extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of his Britannic Majesty, takes the earliest opportunity, in consequence of the express orders of the King, to lay before your High Mightinesses, copies of all the papers which have been exchanged, from the 17th of September last, to the 20th of this month, between Lord Grenville, Secretary of State to his Majesty, and M. Chauvelin.

written without instructions, proved his lordship to be very unfit for his situation; and which, if written by the instructions of Minis-

" The King, High and Mighty Lords, is firmly persuaded, that the sentiments and principles expressed by Great Britain, are perfectly conformable to those which animate your Republic, and that your High Mightinesses are disposed fully to concur in the measures which the present crisis demands, and which are a necessary consequence of those sentiments and principles.

" The circumstances which have led to this crisis are too recent, and the conduct of the King is too well known, for the undersigned to have occasion here to enter into any long detail. It is not quite four years since certain miscreants, assuming the name of Philosophers, have presumed to think themselves capable of establishing a new system of civil society. In order to realize this dream, the offspring of vanity, it became necessary for them to overturn and destroy all established notions of subordination, of morals, and of religion, which had hitherto constituted the security, the happiness, and the consolation, of mankind. These destructive projects have but too well succeeded; but the effects of the new system, which they wished to introduce, have only served to demonstrate the folly and wickedness of its authors. The events which have since so rapidly followed, surpass, in atrocity, all that has hitherto sullied the page of history; property, liberty, security, and even life itself, have been the sport of this unbridled frenzy of the passions, of this spirit of rapine, of hatred, and of the most cruel and unnatural ambition. The annals of mankind cannot present a period in which, in so short a space, so many crimes have been committed, so many misfortunes produced, and so many tears shed; in a word, at this very moment these horrors appear to have attained their utmost height.

ters, proved that, while, as they pretended, they were courting peace, they were using every manœuvre to provoke war.

" During all this time, the King, surrounded by his people, who enjoyed, under the favour of Providence, a degree of prosperity without example, could not behold the misfortunes of others without the strongest emotions of pity and indignation: but, faithful to his principles, his Majesty has never permitted himself to interfere in the internal concerns of a foreign nation; he has never departed from that system of neutrality which he had adopted.

" This conduct, (which the King has seen with satisfaction, to have been equally observed by Your High Mightinesses) the good faith of which all Europe has acknowledged, and which ought to have been respected on many other accounts, has not been sufficient to secure his Majesty, his people, and the Republic, from the most dangerous, and the most criminal, conspiracies.

" For several months past, projects of ambition and aggrandizement, dangerous to the tranquillity and the security of all Europe, have been openly avowed; attempts have been made to spread throughout England and this country, maxims subversive of all social order, and they have not scrupled to give to these detestable attempts the name of a Revolutionary Power. Ancient and solemn treaties, guaranteed by the King, have been infringed, and the rights and territories of the Republic have been violated. His Majesty has, therefore, in his wisdom, judged it necessary to make preparations proportioned to the nature of the circumstances. The King has consulted his Parliament; and the measures which his Majesty had thought fit to take, have been received with the most lively and unanimous approbation, of a people who abhor anar-

Mr. Fox wholly omitted to notice what constituted a principal point of consideration, in the discussion of this question, that the memorial of Lord Auckland, which gave him so much displeasure, and from which he drew

chy and irreligion, who love their King, and who will maintain their constitution.

" Such, High and Mighty Lords, are the motives of a conduct, the wisdom and equity of which have hitherto insured to the King your concert and co-operation.

" His Majesty, in all that he has done, has ever been vigilant in the support of the rights and the security of the United Provinces. The declaration which the undersigned had the honour to deliver to your High Mightinesses, on the 13th of November last, and the arrival of a small squadron, destined to protect the coasts of the Republic, until their own maritime force should be assembled, are strong proofs of this fact. Your High Mightinesses have witnessed the disposition of the King, in every thing which his Majesty has hitherto done.—You will not be less sensible of it in the measures which are now preparing. In consequence, his Majesty is persuaded, that he shall continue to experience, on the part of your High Mightinesses, a perfect conformity of principle and conduct. This conformity can alone give to the united efforts of the two countries, the energy necessary for their common defence; to oppose a barrier to those evils with which Europe is menaced; and to preserve, against every attempt, the security, the tranquillity, and the independence of a State, the happiness of which your High Mightinesses ensure, by the wisdom and firmness of your government.

" Done at the Hague, the 25th January, 1793.

(Signed) " AUCKLAND."

such unwarrantable inferences, was not drawn up till four days after the murder of the King of France, till one day after the executive council had issued orders for the recall of Chauvelin, and till long after it had become notorious, that they were bent on waging war against all the neighbouring powers, as necessary for the accomplishment of their avowed plan for *revolutionizing* all Europe. There was nothing advanced in this memorial which was not strictly true, and which it was not perfectly right to press, at such a moment, upon the attention of our allies. But any reflections which represented the French revolution as different from that stupendous monument of human wisdom, which the disordered optics of Mr. Fox, and of his little band of political coadjutors, had seen in it, was certain to call forth the pointed censure of the opposition. The orator then transferred the scene of his observations from France to Poland, in order to represent the conduct of Russia and Prussia, in interfering to produce a counter-revolution in that country, as infinitely more mischievous, and more atrocious, than that of the French rebels and regicides; and as calling more imperatively for the effective interposition of Great Britain. The tyrannical conduct of the courts of Berlin and St. Petersburgh, on that

occasion, deserved all the censure which it received from Mr. Fox; and it was animadverted on, with becoming severity, in a former chapter.—But, in the first place, the remote situation of Poland rendered the transactions in that country of less consequence to England, than the events of a revolution which had occurred, as it were, at her very doors.—Besides the principles avowed by the authors of the counter-revolution, in the one country, and those promulgated by the leaders of the revolution in the other, though equally inadequate to defend the conduct of those who acted upon them, were not only at variance with each other, but were directly opposite in their effects on other nations.—Nor should it have escaped the recollection of Mr. Fox, that he had himself interfered, not long before, and most unconstitutionally, to *prevent* the interference of the British Court, in curbing the ambitious spirit of the Russian Empress, who, at that time, had resolved to effect a counter-revolution in Poland.

Having embodied his opinions, in the form of resolutions, he submitted them to the House, whom he called upon to declare, that it was not for the honour or interest of Great Britain, to make war upon France on account of the internal circumstances of that country, for the

purpose of either suppressing or punishing any opinions and principles, however pernicious in their tendency, which might prevail there; or of establishing, among the French people, any particular form of government:—that the particular complaints which had been stated against the conduct of the French government were not of a nature to justify war in the first instance, without having attempted to obtain redress by negotiation;—that it appeared to the House, that in the late negotiation between his Majesty's Ministers, and the agents of the French government, the said Ministers did not take such measures as were likely to procure redress without a rupture, for the grievances of which they complained; and, particularly, that they never stated, distinctly, to the French government, any terms or conditions, the accession to which, on the part of France, would induce his Majesty to persevere in a system of neutrality; that it did not appear that the security of Europe, and the rights of independent nations, which had been stated as grounds of war against France, had been attended to by his Majesty's Ministers in the case of Poland, in the invasion of which unhappy country, both in the last year, and more recently, the most open contempt of the law of nations, and the most unjustifiable spirit of aggrandize-

ment had been manifested, without having produced, as far as appeared to the House, any remonstrance from his Majesty's Ministers;—and, finally, that it was the duty of his Majesty's Ministers, in the present crisis, to advise his Majesty against entering into engagements which might prevent Great Britain from making a separate peace, whenever the interests of his Majesty, and his people, might render such a measure advisable, or which might countenance an opinion in Europe, that his Majesty was acting in concert with other powers, for the unjustifiable purpose of compelling the people of France to submit to a form of government not approved by that nation.

Mr. Fox must have known that resolutions of this kind could never be adopted by the House, which had so recently supported the address to the Throne to which these resolutions gave the most complete contradiction. His only object, therefore, must have been to record his sentiments, and, if possible, to prevent the formation of a continental alliance, (which, in the debates on the commercial treaty with France, a few years before, he had strongly and truly represented, as a wise policy on the part of Great Britain,) by means of which the grand object of the war, the repression of French principles, and of French ambition,

might best be attained.—Unless such was his intention, nothing could be more impolitic, or unwise, than to seek to irritate and to enrage the very powers with some of whom his Sovereign had actually formed, and with others of whom he was on the point of forming, alliances; and at the commencement of a war too!—And if such *were* his intention, this circumstance, coupled with his avowed admiration of the French revolution, and with his connection with Chauvelin, exempts all those who have accused him of a predilection for French principles, and of entertaining a wish for the success of the French cause, from the charge of groundless prejudice, and hasty decision.

The Minister took no part in the discussion which followed these resolutions. —— Mr. Burke averred, that there was not an argument then used, or a proposition made, by Mr. Fox, which he had not seen, in French papers, declared to be such arguments and such propositions *as would be offered* to that House.* Whether this strange coincidence arose from accident, or whether the opinions alluded to were taken by Brissot, and Mr. Fox, one from the other, or grew out of one common stock, Mr. Burke left to the House to decide. He then ridiculed the novelty of Mr.

* Debrett's Parliamentary Debates for 1793. P. 508.

Fox's conduct in recommending one war, while he deprecated another; and stated his reasons for thinking that the conduct of Russia and Prussia towards Poland, which he highly disapproved, afforded no just grounds for involving this country in a contest with them. He represented French aggrandizement, and French encroachment, as the first objects of England's vigilance and jealousy. — France was near—Prussia and Poland were distant.—England had seen Sweden overturn the Constitution of Poland; she afterwards saw the Czar depose Stanislaus, and put Augustus on the Throne of that kingdom.—In short, she saw various revolutions in Poland, and, ultimately, a partition of it, and never stirred a hand; nor did Mr. Fox himself ever propose that she should stir, till the moment, when the hostile and dangerous proceedings in France called for the whole force and energy of the country to be directed against her. This mode of acting was new and unprecedented. When war was declared by France, and every multiplied offence offered against Great Britain; when every principle she adopted, and every act she committed, should be condemned and resisted; to censure that resistance, to turn the attention of the House to a remote part of the world, and neglect the balance of power at and near home, was inexplicable conduct.

Mr. Burke commented, with great propriety, on the extraordinary disposition which Mr. Fox had lately manifested to find France always just.—Though, by taking possession of Geneva and Basil, she had destroyed the independence of Switzerland; though, by taking Mentz, she had secured to herself the navigation of the Rhine; though, by entering, and, under the mask of friendship, seizing upon the low countries, she had aggrandized herself beyond all bounds; and though she had, under the same mask, entered Savoy, annexed it to her dominions, and planted the sterile tree of liberty in that sterile soil; and though she had ultimately declared war against Great Britain, France was still most just, and Great Britain was always wrong!! Mr. Fox having called the King of Prussia *a swindler*, Mr. Burke reprobated the use of such language, as highly improper and disrespectful. He stated the difference between the relative situation of Prussia and of France to this country.—The latter, exclusive of her enormities, was an enemy; besides, she had vilified the King and Constitution of England, and was, therefore, a fit object of opprobrium. But to abuse the King of Prussia, who was in alliance with us, was neither politic nor decorous. Indeed, the *Sans culottes* language seemed now to have

become the *bon ton.* The word despot was a new epithet in diplomatic language.—Mr. Burke, however, reminded the House that this country had formed alliances with some of the greatest despots on the earth. It had been her policy to consider not the character of her ally, but his ability to assist her in checking the ambitious spirit of France. The grand alliance was formed for the purpose of interfering with the internal government of that kingdom, and to compel Louis XIV. to convene the States-General. He then proceeded to state his decided opinion, that France was not, at this time, in a situation to negotiate with other powers.—It was evident, from their very title, that the *Provisionary Executive Council* had no authority to treat—they had no power, either by delegation or usage.—Roland, he described as a factious traitor, who had deceived the confidence of his King, and led him on to ruin. Le Brun was the son of a Swiss porter, and rose to the rank of Minister of State, from being an obscure scribe at Liege, and afterwards the conductor of a newspaper. He was driven from Liege with disgrace, to adorn the senate and executive administration of the French government. There was nothing, then, in the personal characters of these men, to give them sufficient consequence to be accepted as the

substitute for a regular government, and to supply the defect of legitimate authority.—Condorcet, the most humane of all murderers, and Brissot, the most virtuous of all pick-pockets, were not, in the estimation of Mr. Burke, of weight enough to assume the power. Dumouriez could not answer for the obedience of his army; he, therefore, was out of the question. As to Chauvelin, the black ingratitude which marked his character must excite the abhorrence of every honest man. His father was a servant to the King, and died one day, suddenly, in attendance on his person; the King took his son, then only five years old, under his protection, put him in his father's place, and brought him up; and the return which he made for this kindness, was to join the band of wretches who murdered his benefactor.—In short, upon a minute examination of the conduct of the whole National Convention, Mr. Burke declared his inability to find one of the members who was not stained with the most infamous crimes. In the whole group, taking Roberspierre, Santerre, and all, the only man of any degree of honour among them, was the hangman.—That poor fellow had some degree of feeling from which his colleagues were exempt; he had the spirit to refuse to execute the King himself, though there was

no want of deputies.* Mr. Burke, finally, declared his fixed opinion, that if we continued at peace with France, the government of this country would not last ten years.

The debate was carried on for some time, by Mr. Grey, Mr. Adam, Mr. Jekyll, Mr. Vaughan, Mr. Lambton, Mr. William Smith, and Major Maitland, (brother to the Earl of Lauderdale) who adopted the opinions and principles of Mr. Fox, without adducing any additional argument, in support of them; and by Mr. Jenkinson, Mr. Powys, Mr. Windham, Sir Richard Hill, Sir Francis Basset, Sir George Cornwall, and Sir Henry Houghton, on the other side. On a division, the resolutions of Mr. Fox were rejected by two hundred and seventy-four members, against forty-four, being the whole number that voted with Mr. Fox. In the course of this discussion, Mr. Burke, in proving the disposition of the French government to interfere in the internal concerns of England, quoted a passage from a speech of Danton, in the convention, who remarked, "that the scaffold erected in Westminster Hall, for the eternal trial of Mr. Hastings, would serve for the British Ministers, and even—

* Debrett's Parliamentary Debates for 1793. P. 513—514.

(Mr. Burke said, he felt an almost insuperable horror in expressing it)—even for GEORGE himself!" But so multifarious, and so notorious were the proofs of this hostile and aggressive disposition, that nothing but scepticism, bordering on insanity, could doubt, and nothing but wilful blindness could overlook, it. Notwithstanding the decision of the House, Mr. Grey, on the 21st of February, brought forward another string of resolutions, the same in spirit with those of Mr. Fox, but much longer, and containing more assertions at direct variance with facts known to the whole nation. These were treated with marked contempt; they met with a silent negative; and were rejected without a division.

It had been deemed expedient, by his Majesty's Ministers, to erect barracks, for the better accommodation of the troops; and, indeed, from the many attempts which had been already made to imitate the conduct of the French rebels, by seducing the soldiers from their duty, it was highly politic and necessary to let them mix as little as possible with the lower classes of people, in the different towns in which they were quartered. Independently, too, of this important consideration, barracks were more desirable than any other quarters, as they afforded better opportunities for enfor-

cing a strict discipline among the troops, while they released the publican from a very heavy and serious burden. — But, in pursuance of the apparent determination, lately imputed by Mr. Burke to the opposition, to find Great Britain always in the wrong, this erection of barracks was represented, by Mr. M. A. Taylor, as part of a system which betrayed an evident preconcerted design to curb and over-awe the people by the bayonet and the sword, instead of applying, if necessary, the wholesome correction of the laws of England. Mr. Fox supported this preposterous supposition, and argued, at length, against standing armies, as dangerous to the liberties of the subject. The jealousy of standing armies, Mr. Pitt remarked, like other undefined phrases calculated to agitate the minds of men, had been, on former occasions, very successfully employed to excite popular clamour. If, by a standing army, was meant, an army kept up without the authority, or consent, of Parliament, that, indeed, would be an object of jealousy;—but if by it was meant, an army voted from year to year, regulated and paid by Parliament, according to the practice of the constitution, it was no object of national jealousy. Much of the clamour, excited against a standing army, in 1740, had been raised by men whose object was not

merely to weaken the hands of administration, but, by removing the army, to bring in the Pretender, and destroy that very Parliament whose power and authority they affected to magnify. The use, then, made of popular words ought not to be forgotten. The erection of barracks having been coupled with a supposed system of Ministers for passing by the House of Commons, and extending the prerogative of the Crown, Mr. Pitt challenged Mr. Taylor, or any other man, to produce an instance in which the functions of Parliament had been invaded, or the prerogative extended beyond its known constitutional limits.

Mr. Pitt defended the proposed measure of extending the use of barracks, from the peculiar circumstances of the country. Had it been an entirely new measure, he should not have been deterred, by any fear of innovation, from doing that which he knew to be necessary for the safety of the realm;—but he denied that it was an innovation; for, in all places where troops were in general stationary, barracks had long since been erected. A spirit had appeared in some of the manufacturing towns, which made it necessary that troops should be kept near them. In such towns, then, to dispose of the troops in barracks was a much better plan than to distribute them among the mass of

the people, where jealousy might rankle into hatred, and produce tumult and disturbance;—effects which would be effectually prevented by keeping the army in a state of separation from the people.—This plan would, also, operate as a preventive against the seduction of the army, who were, by certain persons, considered as the chief obstacle to the execution of their designs. Mr. Pitt noticed several attempts to corrupt the commonalty, and one, at Edinburgh, to excite a spirit of mutiny among the soldiers, though happily without effect. He closed his speech with an ironical compliment to the eloquence and abilities of Mr. Taylor, and to the knowledge derived from the production of a red Morocco quarto, of Blackstone's works, all which, however combined, had not possessed sufficient power to produce his conversion.—Mr. Pitt having moved the order of the day, it was carried without a division.

On the 25th of February, Mr. Dundas produced his annual statement of Indian affairs, and, in a clear, luminous, and satisfactory detail of the state of India, its expenses, and revenue, proved that these important possessions were in a most flourishing condition, and that, upon an average of three years, of which 1789 was the last, the receipts exceeded the expenditure, by £1,666,079. A few days after, on

the fourth of March, Mr. Sheridan, pursuant to a notice previously given, called the attention of the House of Commons to the alleged existence of seditious practices, and treasonable designs;—when he exerted all the powers of an active mind, and a fertile genius, to represent all the dangers, so generally believed to be real, as the creatures of fancy; the visionary offsprings of a disordered imagination;—and all the measures adopted with a view to avert or to repel them, as the machinations of Ministers to alarm the public, and to reconcile them to a war with France. He moved, that a formal enquiry into the subject should be immediately instituted by the House of Commons.

In opposition to the extraordinary assertions of Mr. Sheridan, Mr. Windham observed, that the real question was, not whether there existed an actual insurrection in the country, but whether there did not appear manifest proofs of a tendency to produce one. He justly remarked, that the notoriety of seditious practices rendered all arguments useless. The adherents of Paine had boasted, that the principles which had produced the revolution in France were operating in this kingdom with the silence and rapidity of thought. Mr. Windham expressed his firm belief of this fact, which, he said, might be ascertained from the general

opinions of the people,—from the fears of those who dreaded, and from the sanguine expectations of those who wished, it. The monarchy of France had been overturned from the neglect to adopt timely measures of prevention;—and he hoped that we should take warning by the lamentable fate of that unhappy country. But these apprehensions, these fears, and these hopes, appeared fit subjects for ridicule to Mr. Fox, who expressed his total disbelief of plots and conspiracies, and his perfect concurrence with the sentiments of Mr. Sheridan. Mr. Burke, however, corroborated the statement of Mr. Windham, and affirmed, that the French had long been connected with a faction in this country, whose object was to force us into an alliance with France, for the purpose of propagating, in concert, the most mischievous principles. He fully substantiated his affirmation, by various extracts from the correspondence of the Revolution Society with the Jacobin Clubs in France, and from the addresses of different bodies of Englishmen to the National Convention. He remarked, that the representatives of the landed interest in France were now nearly annihilated by confiscation and murder, and concluded, that from the moment when equality, and the sovereignty of the people, (as it was called) became the rule of any government,

property must be destroyed, and that religion, morality, and law, which grew out of property, must fall with it. The House was satisfied with the discussion, and came to no division on Mr. Sheridan's motion; which seemed, indeed, to be less calculated to produce any impression on the House itself, than to supply a theme for animadversion out of it.

As the country was now, by the insatiate ambition and aggressive spirit of Republican France, engaged in a war, not only the justice, but the necessity of which was generally acknowledged, (for the negative assertions of Mr. Fox, and the small band of his political associates in the House of Commons, with the disaffected societies in different parts of the country, could only form exceptions to the general rule) it became the duty of the Minister to provide the means for carrying it on with vigour and effect; and, accordingly, on the 11th of March, Mr. Pitt proposed such means to the House. On this occasion he stated his fixed determination, let the expenses of the war be what they might, of strictly adhering to his plan for the reduction of the national debt, by the appropriation of an annual million, with the addition of £200,000, which, it had been agreed, in the preceding year, should be set apart for that purpose. He also expressed his

resolution of avoiding the evil of an accummulation of unfunded debt, by bringing that description of debt to a distinct account every year. He then enumerated the different articles of supply, rating the proposed number of seamen and marines at 45,000, making the whole amount to £11,182,213 3 8½.—This sum included a vote of credit for one million and a half for contingent expenses, as it was probable that a greater number of seamen, and of troops also, than was contained in the present statement, might be wanted in the course of the campaign. The ordinary ways and means to meet this expenditure, including the expected surplus of the consolidated fund to April, 1794, and half a million to be paid by the East India Company, amounted to £6,649,696; and it was proposed to supply the deficiency by a loan of four millions and a half.—In order to pay the interest of this loan, it was meant to continue the taxes which had been imposed for the purpose of defraying the expense of the Spanish armament, which produced £287,000.

Mr. Pitt, on this occasion, remarked, that, as he had always placed his chief glory in promoting the public prosperity of the country, in increasing the revenue, and in the gradual reduction of the national debt, with a view to its final extinction, he never could have given his

countenance to a war which would counteract all his patriotic views, if he had not been fully impressed with the conviction, that it was not only unavoidable, but, under the circumstances of the case, absolutely necessary to the political existence of Great Britain, and of all Europe. In detailing the motives of the war, he said he had heard of wars of honour, which had also been deemed wars of prudence and of policy.—On the present occasion, whatever could raise the feelings, or animate the exertions, of a people, concurred to prompt us to the contest. The contempt which the French had displayed for a neutrality, most rigidly observed on our part; the repeated violations of their plighted faith; their presumptuous attempts to interfere in the government of this country, to arm our subjects against ourselves, to vilify a Monarch, the object of our gratitude, our reverence, and our affections; and to separate the court from the people, by representing them as influenced by different motives, and acting from different interests: after provocations so wanton, so often repeated, and so highly aggravated, did not this become, on our part, a war of honour,—a war necessary to assert the spirit of the nation, and the dignity of the British name? He had heard of wars undertaken for the general security of Europe; had it been ever so threa-

tened as by the progress of the French arms, and by the system of ambition and aggrandizement avowed, adopted, and pursued by the French government? He had heard of wars for the defence of the protestant religion;—our enemies, in this instance, were the enemies of all religions; —of Lutheranism, of Calvinism, of christians of every denomination; and anxious to propagate every where, by the force of their arms, that system of infidelity which they openly embraced. He had heard of wars undertaken in defence of the lawful succession to the throne; but we were now fighting to preserve our hereditary Monarchy: we were at war with those who sought to destroy the whole fabric of our Constitution When he looked at these things, they afforded him encouragement and consolation; and supported him in the discharge of that painful task, to the performance of which he was now called by his duty. The resolutions, for carrying his plan into effect, met the concurrence of the House.

The means for meeting the exigencies of the war being thus provided, the Minister next directed his attention to further measures, for securing the internal tranquillity of the kingdom, and for counteracting the efforts of our enemies, foreign and domestic, to disturb it.— With this view, the Attorney-General brought

in a bill for the prevention of all traitorous correspondence, taken in the legal sense, and full import, of the term, and extending, of course, to all treasonable intercourse and connection whatever. The leading objects of this act, which professed to be founded on the true meaning and spirit of the twenty-fifth of Edward the Third, which constituted the law of treason at this time, went to make it high treason to sell, deliver, or cause to be delivered, to the persons at present exercising the sovereign authority in France, their armies, navies, or subjects, any naval or military stores, coin, bullion, corn, clothing, and other necessaries. 2. To make it high treason, for any British subject, to purchase lands in France, or stock in the French funds, or to lend money upon lands, in France, by way of mortgage. 3. To make it a misdemeanour for any British subject to go to France without a licence under the Privy Seal; for any British subject, actually resident in France, to return to this country without a passport from government, and for any persons, who had so returned without a passport, to leave the place where they landed, without previously giving such security for their good behaviour as might be deemed sufficient by government. And, lastly, the insurance of French ships, during the war, was made a misdemeanour. This bill, in its pro-

gress through the House, was strongly opposed by Mr. Fox, Mr. Sheridan, Mr. Curwen, Mr. Whitbread, Mr. Grey, Mr. Thomas Grenville, and Lord John Russel. It was stigmatized by Mr. Fox, generally, as utterly repugnant to the principles of freedom, justice, and policy, and as militating, in the highest degree, against the interests of the people. His objections extended not merely to the principle, but to every clause, of the bill; and the whole tenour of his arguments displayed the strongest desire to preserve a free and open intercourse with France, as in the time of profound peace, though in direct opposition to the principles and opinions which he had advanced in a former debate, on the commercial treaty with France. He characterized the bill as an attack on the fundamental liberties of England, and as a measure equally ineffectual, impolitic, and tyrannical. Mr. Curwen considered the attempt to prevent the purchase of lands, or stock, in France, as absurd, because no man in his senses would lay out his property in the purchase of lands or stock in France, at a time when there was no regular government there, and, consequently, no security for the enjoyment of property. This supposition was, indeed, natural, but it was contrary to fact, for it was pretty well understood, that a leader of opposition, in the Upper House,

had actually sold a considerable portion of his paternal inheritance, and expended the produce in the purchase of confiscated estates, the fruits of successful rebellion in France; and many purchases had been made by Englishmen in the French funds.

On the other hand, the bill was supported chiefly by the Attorney and Solicitor-General, Mr. Martin, Mr. Frederick North, and Mr. Burke. The first of these defended it from the imputation of tyranny, and shewed that the same provisions had been adopted, in a similar bill, at the era of the revolution. It was considered by Mr. F. North as called for and justified by the exigence of the moment, by the relative situation of the country with respect to France, and by the situation of France herself, with respect to her resources and her means of carrying on the war;—in short, he regarded it as vindicated by every principle of the law of nations which made self-preservation the paramount object of every country. He entered also into a particular examination of each separate provision, and shewed they were all excellently adapted to the purposes for which they were framed.

It was observed by Mr. Burke, that, in those periods when the constitution was allowed to exist in purity and vigour, it might be seen, that provisions, similar to what were now about

to be introduced, had been adopted without difficulty, and, without inconvenience, obeyed. The suspension of the habeas corpus act was the first which followed the bill of rights, and the other laws by which our constitution was, at that period, secured. Five successive acts of Parliament had passed, every one of which contained similar enactments; and it was worthy of remark, that all these measures had been adopted when the government was in the hands of the Whigs, who deemed them defensive securities of the liberties of the nation.—In this case the Whigs had been supported by the Tories; both united to repel arbitrary power, and to check the more odious despotism of a republic; and both joined in repelling the common enemy with that sincerity, honour, and patriotism, which characterized every honest Englishman. He entered into the consideration of the bill in two points of view, for the purpose of ascertaining whether it was conformable to law, and whether it was consistent with policy; and, having satisfied his mind that it was both constitutional and politic, he assented to it, in the persuasion that it would tend to prohibit an adulterous communication with France, and, by withholding from that country resources to be derived from this, would prevent Englishmen from acting hostilely against England, and from making contracts to promote its ruin.

Mr. Fox endeavoured to prolong the discussions on the bill, and to retard the period of its passing, for the avowed purpose of ascertaining the sentiments of the people upon its merits; but the delay was strongly resisted by Mr. Pitt, and it finally passed, in the month of April, by 154 votes against 53. In the House of Lords this bill was warmly attacked by the Duke of Norfolk, the Marquis of Lansdowne, and the Earls of Guildford, *Lauderdale*, and Stanhope.—But the opposition here, as in the House of Commons, proved stronger in language than in numbers, for, on a division, they were supported only by *eleven votes*.

CHAPTER XXVII.

Means adopted for supporting the Allies of Great Britain—Negotiations for new alliances on the Continent—Designs of the French upon Holland—Dumouriez the supposed author of the plan for the invasion of the United Provinces—Precautions suggested by Lord Auckland, and taken by the Dutch Government, for defeating his plan—Dumouriez's proclamation to the People of Holland—Contradictory to his own avowed principles—Reprinted, with comments, by the States-General—The French enter Holland—Breda surrenders, through the treachery of the Governor—Gertruydenberg follows the example—Brave but ineffectual resistance of the garrison of Klundert—Gallant conduct of Boetzelaar, the Governor of Williamstadt—Fruitless attempts of the French to reduce that Fortress—Memorial, presented by Lord Auckland and the Imperial Minister, to the States-General—Observations upon it—It is attacked by Mr. Sheridan, in the House of Commons—Animadversions upon his speech—The memorial is defended by Mr. Pitt—Stigmatized by Mr. Fox—His misrepresentations of the views of the Combined Powers exposed and corrected—Mr. Sheridan's motion for an Address to the King negatived by two hundred and eleven votes against thirty-six—Similar address moved in the Upper House by Lord Lauderdale—Opposed by Lord

Grenville—Rejected by the House.—The House adopt, by a vote of approbation, the sentiments expressed in the Memorial—Inquiry into the source of the interest taken by the Opposition in the fate of the Commissioners detained, as hostages, by Dumouriez—Character and conduct of the Commissioners—All of them shewn to be Traitors and Regicides—Reflections on the crime of murder, and the expediency of an universal compact of nations, for the punishment of murderers, suggested—Temporary distress in the commercial world—Effective measures adopted by Mr. Pitt for their relief—Mr. Grey's plan of Parliamentary Reform—Supported by Mr. Whitbread—His notions upon certain great events in English History examined—Mr. Pitt opposes the motion—Shews the radical difference between the plan of Reform which he had formerly suggested himself and that now proposed by Mr. Grey—He takes a view of the effects produced by the conduct of the French Reformers—Shews, from a similarity of sentiment and language, that all the petitions, presented to the House, had been the work of the same hands—Contends that the House cannot entertain petitions for a pretended right of Universal Suffrage—Ridicules the idea of abstract rights in a Social State—Accuses the present plan of being founded on French principles; and traces its consequences to the introduction of French Anarchy—Proves all the modern theories of Reform to be calculated only to deceive and delude the people—Mr. Fox and Mr. Sheridan support Mr. Grey's plan, and tax Mr. Pitt with inconsistency—Motion rejected by 282 against 41.—New motion by Mr. Fox for promoting a peace with France—Opposed by Mr. Windham and Mr. Burke—Mr. Pitt's speech on the subject—Asserts the impolicy of any advance to the French Government, and the impracticability of making peace at the present juncture—Motion negatived by 187 against 47—Parliament prorogued.

[1793.] The attention of Mr. Pitt was not limited, during this period, to the adoption of such measures as were necessary for the preservation of domestic tranquillity, nor to those financial and military preparations which a state of warfare requires, but was extended to the grand object of inspiring those powers who were already in alliance with us, with courage and confidence, by promises of active co-operation and effective support; and to the acquisition of new allies, in order to strengthen the grand confederacy against France, now justly considered as the general enemy of all thrones, of all regular authority, and of all established dominion. The arms of Republican France had kept pace with her principles. The King of Sardinia, attacked without the smallest pretence, had been dethroned, and his dominions annexed to France.—The Independent States of Genoa, Geneva, and Switzerland, had not escaped the destructive rage of these general disturbers of the peace of nations, who already displayed the most determined resolution to carry into full effect their theoretic system for promoting the revolution of Europe.

On the side of Germany, Spires, Worms, and Mentz, had surrendered to the conventional troops;—the Bishoprick of Liege had acknowledged their superiority; and the whole of the

Austrian Netherlands, overrun by their arms, had experienced the natural effects of French fraternity, in every species of violence, rapine, fraud, and oppression.—The invasion of Holland had been projected, long before the declaration of war against the Stadtholder; and it is highly probable that Dumouriez himself was the author of the project;—certain, at least, it is, that a mode of carrying it into execution had been devised, and suggested, by that general, early in the winter. The British ambassador at the Hague, however, whose vigilance and zeal had succeeded in gaining full information of this notable scheme, had, in concert with the Dutch government, adopted precautionary measures for the defeat of its object. Immediately after the declaration of war, preparations were made for the execution of the plan, and the active and sanguine mind of Dumouriez anticipated, in the conquest of Holland, the acquisition of fresh laurels, and new and copious sources of plunder. He proposed to march, with the greater part of his army to the shores of the Bies Bosch, an arm of the sea which he meant to cross at Moerdyke, with a view to land at Daert, where he expected to be joined by a numerous body of Dutch rebels. Thus reinforced, he hoped, by a rapid march, by Rotterdam, Leyden, and Haarlem, to bear

down all opposition, and to enter the gates of Amsterdam in triumph.—During this time, strong divisions were stationed to keep in check the Dutch fortresses, to his right and left, Breda, Gertruydenberg, Bergen-op-zoom, Klundert, and Williamstadt;—while Miranda, with a powerful force, was destined to attack Maestricht and Nimeguen.

Before he embarked on this arduous enterprize, he issued, from his head-quarters, at Antwerp, a proclamation, addressed to the people of Holland, in the true style of those revolutionary and regicidal jacobins, whose principles he professed to abhor, and whose conduct he had long, privately, condemned.—He told the Dutch, that their Stadtholder violated his duty, and held them in slavery and oppression; ---they had formerly, he said, appealed to the French nation for succour, but as France herself then groaned under the despotism of a perfidious court, they were made the sport of vile intriguers, who then governed France. Every hope that could excite to revolt, every argument that could animate to rebellion, was held out to seduce the people from their duty. French freedom, and French generosity, (which Dumouriez himself at this time *knew*, and soon after *acknowledged*, to be the most galling slavery, and the most degrading oppression) were extolled; and free-

dom and security promised, in the usual language of the republican demagogues. The Dutch were assured, that it was not against them that the French nation had declared war; friends to all people, tyrants were her only enemies. The English, so proud of their liberty, suffered themselves to be misled by gold, and by the falsehoods of a despot, of whom he did not scruple to predict they would soon be weary. The more enemies the French had to encounter, the more would their principles be propagated: persuasion and victory would support the imprescriptible rights of man, and nations would be weary of exhausting their blood and treasures for a small number of individuals, who kept discord alive merely to deceive and to enslave the people. He proceeded to declare, that the French had no enmity but to the Prince of Orange, and his supporters; (that is, all good and loyal Dutchmen;) and that such of the people who would rise against their oppressors, should partake of the plunder of their property. But this revolutionary logic made but little impression on the sober minds of the States-General, who reprinted Dumouriez's proclamation, accompanied with appropriate comments, demonstrating its fallacy, its folly, its profligacy, and its falsehood.

On the Seventeenth of February, Dumou-

riez's army entered the Dutch territory, and took their station between Breda and Bergen-op-zoom; while the advanced guard pushed forward to the shores of the Bies Bosch, in order to seize all the vessels which could be found, for transporting the army to their destined place of debarcation. But that same zeal and vigilance which had already discovered Dumouriez's plan, had, amongst other precautions, removed all those vessels which were so necessary to its accomplishment. While Dumouriez was employed in devising means for the removal of this obstacle, which, strange to say, he had not foreseen, General D'Arçon was instructed to lay siege to the strong and important fortress of Breda. The total inadequacy of his force to the enterprize for which it was destined, renders it highly probable that the French Commander trusted, for its success, to other instruments than arms. Coupt Byland, the governor, after an ineffectual canonnade of three days, which had made not the smallest impression on the place, though it had nearly exhausted the ammunition of the little army which besieged it, basely violated his trust, and surrendered the town to the enemy.—For this act of treachery, or of cowardice, he was afterwards tried, convicted, disgraced, and imprisoned for life.—Klundert was next attacked; and, though much less capable of defence than Breda, it was much

better defended by the governor, who, being reduced to extremity, spiked his guns, and retired, with his brave garrison, towards Williamstadt;—but he was unfortunately met, on his road, by a superior force, and, after a gallant resistance, met his fate in the field of honour, while his troops became prisoners to the French.

After the reduction of Breda, Gertruydenberg was attacked by the same troops, and basely surrendered, without a struggle. Not so the little fortress of Williamstadt, which was defended with the greatest gallantry, by the brave Boetzelaer, who treated, with equal contempt, the menaces and the attacks of the assailants, headed by General Berneron. While this officer was employed in the siege of Williamstadt, while Miranda made vain efforts to reduce the fortress of Maestricht, and while Dumouriez was anxiously engaged in collecting a flotilla to convey his army to the land of promise, the veteran, General Clerfayt, who had maintained his station, during the winter, behind the Erfft, until he had received sufficient reinforcements to enable him to resume an offensive attitude, now sallied forth, most unexpectedly, poured down with his troops, like a torrent, on the French cantonments, swept every thing before him, and compelled the French commanders to forego, for the present,

their schemes of conquest, and to limit their operations to measures of defence.

On the fifth of April, Lord Auckland, then the British Ambassador at the Hague, presented, in conjunction with the Austrian Minister, a memorial to the States-General, reminding them, that, in the preceding September, they, and his Britannic Majesty, had given a solemn assurance, that, in case the imminent danger which then threatened the lives of their most Christian Majesties, and their families, should be realized, they would not fail to pursue the most efficacious measures to prevent the persons who might render themselves guilty of so atrocious a crime from finding any asylum in their respective States. This event, his Lordship observed, had since taken place, and the divine vengeance seemed not to have been tardy. Some of these detestable regicides were now in such a situation that they could be subjected to the sword of the law; the rest were still in the midst of a people whom they had plunged into an abyss of evils, and for whom famine, anarchy, and civil war, were about to prepare new calamities. In short, every thing which had occurred, seemed to sanction the belief, that the end of those wretches, whose madness and atrocities had filled with terror and indignation all those who

respected the principles of religion, morality, and humanity, was not far distant.—It was, therefore, submitted to the enlightened judgment of the States, whether it would not be proper to employ all the means in their power to prohibit from entering their dominions in Europe, or their colonies, all those members of the National Convention, or of the pretended Executive Council, who had, directly or indirectly, participated in the said crime; and, if they should be discovered and arrested, to deliver them up to justice, that they might serve as a lesson to mankind.—In answer to this memorial, the States-General declared their hearty concurrence with the sentiments which it contained, and their resolution to deliver up any of the French regicides, who might fall into their hands, to the end that they might be pursued by justice, and punished with all the severity of the law.

This memorial, which only breathed that virtuous indignation against regicides which every honest mind must feel, and which only recommended that mode of proceeding against them, which was consonant with the laws both of God and of man, and which, indeed, was rendered necessary by the paramount principle of self-preservation; since there was not a crowned head, nor a legitimate Prince, in

Europe, whom they had not openly devoted to destruction; was considered, by some of the philanthropic members of the British Opposition, in a very different light from that in which it had appeared to the States-General of Holland.—On the twenty-fifth of April, Mr. Sheridan, who had, from the commencement of the revolution, evinced the most lively sensibility for the rebels of France, introduced this memorial to the notice of the House of Commons. His pretence for so doing was, that it contained sentiments hostile to the avowed object of the war; seeming to him to imply, that the war was carried on for the purpose of extermination.—There was not, however, one sentence, or expression, in the whole of the memorial, that conveyed any such idea, or that could sanction any such interpretation. But Mr. Sheridan complained that it stigmatized the French, as a nation of miscreants, and proposed, that the commissioners of the Convention, (who, by the treachery of Dumouriez, had been given up to the Dutch) should be murdered and assassinated. There was no such general reflection on the French nation to be found in the memorial, and the only proposal which was made, was to prevent the murderers of Louis the XVIth from receiving an asylum in the territories of Holland, or, if they came

thither, to subject them to a legal process, and to legal punishment.—The commissioners had not been delivered up to the Dutch by Dumouriez, but to the Austrians, who had, indeed, sent them to Maestricht, for safe custody. And what appeared to Mr. Sheridan as *treachery*, on the part of the French General, must be regarded by others as *self-preservation*, since the commissioners had been sent for the express purpose of conveying Dumouriez to the scaffold; for it is certain that his death must have speedily followed his arrival at Paris;—and, indeed, if his own account may be credited, care had been taken to station bands of assassins on the road, at Gournay, Roye, and Senlis, in order to murder him.* Mr. Sheridan further stated, that this bloody proposal extended not only to those who voted for the King's death in the Convention, but to the communes, and the departments. It is almost superfluous to observe, after having faithfully given the substance of the memorial, that it did not extend either to the communes or the departments, but was expressly limited to those who were concerned in the murder of the King.—The passage on which all these assertions were prin-

* Memoires du General Dumouriez, ecrits par lui-même. P. 106.

cipally founded, and which incurred his strongest reprobation, was that which described some of those regicides as being in a situation to be subjected to the law. Hence, too, he drew the most unwarrantable inference, that, if the Ministers agreed with Lord Auckland, the war would necessarily become a war of extermination, and all hopes of peace would prove fruitless, until a new form of government should be accepted by France.—He then moved an address, beseeching his Majesty to disavow the sentiments contained in the memorial, as inconsistent with the wisdom and humanity of the British nation, and derogatory to the dignity of the British Crown.

The defence of Lord Auckland against this extraordinary attack was undertaken by Mr. Pitt, who declared his conviction that, for his general services, that nobleman merited the applause, and not the censure, of his country. He truly maintained, that the memorial contained no expression which could properly be construed as bearing the most remote tendency to the conclusions drawn from it. Lord Auckland's language he described as the warm effusion of a mind animated with a just abhorrence of those men who had perpetrated a deed which excited the general indignation of Englishmen, and enlivened with the hope that an example

would be made of them. Sentiments of this kind were no other than what he professed to entertain himself, and what, he thought, every Englishman must entertain with him. He cautiously declared, however, at the same time, that he by no means conceived any thing of this nature a proper object of our interference.

In the whole memorial, he insisted, there was not a single sentence which implied any alteration of the purposes of the war, or which could effect it, either in its progress or its termination. Stronger terms of reprobation, against the murderers of Louis the Sixteenth, had not been used by Lord Auckland than had been contained in every address of that House to his Majesty, and in every answer to those addresses. But nothing, he contended, could be fairly extracted from it, which pledged Great Britain to make the internal government of France regulate the purposes of the war.—We were engaged in hostilities from principles of policy and self-defence. Europe was threatened with a political convulsion, which, if passively submitted to, would, at once, introduce anarchy, and a total change of the existing governments. But the impatience of France had left us no alternative, by a declaration of war before any hostile measure had been adopted on our part. The real cause of the war, therefore, was evident to

every capacity, and the effect of it, he hoped, would be, that, with the assistance of Divine Providence, we should ultimately obtain indemnification for the past, and security for the future.

In answer to Mr. Sheridan's assertion, that a general proscription of all, in the Communes and Departments, supposed to be concerned in the King's murder, was insinuated in the memorial, he observed, that to force such a construction upon it was unjust, ridiculous, and unsupported by any document whatever. With regard to the passage selected as a subject for particular censure, Mr. Pitt was confident that Lord Auckland meant no more than that, at a proper and convenient time, the regicides should be tried by their own countrymen, and, if guilty, suffer the punishment which they deserved. The idea was simply this, that, as a counter-revolution was likely to take place in France, by the desertion of Dumouriez, and the success of the Austrian arms, the persons principally concerned in the murder of the King might soon be in a situation to be brought before criminal tribunals in their own country, and be thus subjected to the sword of the law.

This explanation did not satisfy Mr. Fox, who resolved to draw from the memorial the same inference which Mr. Sheridan had chosen

to draw from it, and he took this opportunity to express a hope, that, while contending with one species of tyranny, we should take care not to tolerate the adoption of another still more dangerous by our connection with the allied powers, and a participation of their views. In his opinion, despotism was more formidable than anarchy; as the latter, in its very nature, could prove but momentary, while the former, by being more systematic, became more permanent.

It may be here worth while to enquire what that despotism was which the allied powers were thus accused of exercising towards France, and what those views were which the British Ministers were cautioned not to adopt? Happily for the cause of truth, the Prince of Saxe Cobourg, who commanded the Austrian troops in the Netherlands, had recently, in the name of the allied powers, avowed, in the most explicit manner, the nature of their views, in respect of the French nation. Immediately on the defection of Dumouriez, who had proposed to march with his army to Paris, to dissolve the Convention, to bring the regicides to punishment, to liberate the Queen, to proclaim the Dauphin King, and to restore the Monarchy, as established by the constitution of 1789, the Prince of Saxe Cobourg addressed a proclamation to the French, in which he declared it to be

the unanimous wish of all the Sovereigns who had been compelled, by the factious, to take up arms against France, and principally that of the Emperor and of the King of Prussia, who were yet filled with esteem for the French nation, so great and so generous, among whom the immutable principles of justice and honour were formerly so sacred, before the effect of the general overthrow of all order had deluded and corrupted that part of the people, who, under the mask of humanity and patriotism, had no other language than that of assassination and poniards, to put an end to the anarchy and calamities which convulsed the country, and to procure it the happiness of a constitution, and of a wise and solid government. The Prince avowed his resolution to support, by all the force which he had, the generous and beneficent intentions of Dumouriez, and his brave army. He declared, that if Dumouriez should desire the assistance of any part of his troops to join the French, they should co-operate as friends and brothers in arms, worthy of reciprocal esteem, in order to give to France her constitutional King, *the Constitution which she had formed for herself*, and, of course, the means of correcting it, if the nation should find it imperfect; and to revive in France, as well as in all the rest of Europe, peace, confidence, tranquillity, and happiness.

He pledged his honour, that he should not enter France to make conquests, but solely and purely for the ends which he had explained. He further declared, in the most solemn manner, that if the military operations should require that any strong place or places should be delivered over to his troops, he should consider them only as sacred deposits; and he engaged, in the most express and positive manner, to restore them as soon as the government which should be established in France, or the general with whom he was to make a common cause, should require it.*

Here was a clear, full, and explicit declaration of the views which actuated the combined powers at this period; and which sufficiently proved that they had no wish to impose laws upon France, but only desired to promote the happiness of her people, by enabling them to re-establish that constitution which they had framed for themselves, and which they had sworn to maintain, and to restore peace and security to Europe. Yet, these views, which were suggested by a most liberal and enlightened policy, and which, after the multiplied aggressions that had been exercised by the French regicides, against all the Sovereigns of Europe, displayed a degree of generosity seldom to be

* See this Proclamation among the State Papers in Rivington's Annual Register for 1793. P. 308.

witnessed in national contests, were branded, by Mr. Fox, as tyrannical, and deprecated as unfit for the British government to adopt!

The motion for the address was rejected by 211 votes against 36.—The subject, however, was revived by Lord Stanhope in the House of Lords, who afforded Lord Auckland an opportunity of disavowing, in person, the motives which had been imputed to him by those who seemed to tremble for the fate of the French regicides. His Lordship declared, that it had never entered his mind that they should be put to death, in Holland; he only meant that they should be kept in custody till such time as the course of justice should be restored in France, and that then they should be tried in courts competent to that purpose. Lord Stanhope's motion for an address, similar to that proposed by Mr. Sheridan, in the Commons, ended in a vote moved by Lord Grenville,—That the paper in question was conformable to the sentiments of his Majesty, and of both Houses of Parliament, and that it was consonant to those ideas of justice and policy which it became the honour and dignity of the nation to express.

It will, no doubt, be a matter of surprise to posterity, that such a deep interest should have been taken by members of the British Senate, in the fate of men who were the imme-

diate agents of a government which had proclaimed war against every regular state in Europe, and had vowed particular vengeance against the Monarchy and the Constitution of Great Britain; and they will naturally be led to enquire into the source of such sickly philanthropy, and into the characters of the individuals who had excited such particular interest.—What deeds they had achieved,—what virtues they had displayed,—and what merits they possessed! The four French commissioners, the objects of the patriotic solicitude of the British Opposition, were *Le Camus, La Marque, Bancal,* and *Quinette.*—Camus was bred a lawyer, and was advocate to the clergy, to whom he was indebted for the means of subsistence, and whom, after the revolution, he persecuted in every possible way. He exerted himself, in the States-General, of which he was a member, to procure the suppression of the nobility, and of all the orders of knighthood, and the plunder of their property. In the month of December, 1790, he made a most seditious speech, in which he called upon the Assembly to *compel* the King to give his assent to the civil constitution of the clergy. Having been returned to the Convention as member for the department of Upper Loire, he proposed a decree, which was adopted, for the seizure and sale of the property of emigrants, and of all religious houses.

In December following, *before* the unhappy King had been subjected even to the form of a trial, this sanguinary wretch moved, that he should be declared *guilty*, and an enemy to the nation. He was sent as commissioner to the army soon after, and Dumouriez says, that he set off post, from Liege, to vote for the death of Louis XVI.* but as, in taking down the votes on the 20th of January, he was declared to be "*absent on commission*,"†—he must have stopped on the road. — It appears, however, that, "he wrote to the Convention, to inform them that he voted *for the death of the tyrant*,"‡ although he had not been present at his trial! Lamarque was also bred to the law, and was member for the department of *the Dordogne*, both in the Legislative Assembly and in the Convention. He was one of the most ferocious of the Jacobins. On the 28th of March, 1791, he proposed to dismiss all the judges, because they were not sufficiently *patriotic*. On the 10th of August, he was one of the rebels, who attacked the King's Palace, and the author

* Memoires. P. 114.

† Le Moniteur, ou Gazette Universelle, Dimanche, Le 20 Janvier, 1793. P. 95.

‡ Dictionnaire des Hommes Marquans, &c. Vol. I. P. 262.

of an address to the people, calling on them to sanction this act of violence and treason. He voted for the death of the King, saying,—"He is guilty,—he was perjured,—he was a traitor;"—words particularly descriptive of Lamarque's own character.

Bancal was a member of the Convention, and voted for the imprisonment of the King, during the war, and his subsequent banishment for life. He assigned eleven reasons for preferring this sentence to the infliction of a capital punishment. The chief of which were, because imprisonment and punishment were preferred, by "Thomas Payne, the most mortal enemy of Kings and of Royalty, and whose suffrage is to me *posterity anticipated;*"*—and, because he considered the punishment of death as "absurd, barbarous, tending to produce a ferocity of manners, and one of the great causes of the evils which afflict the human race." But lest these sentiments should be ascribed to feelings of humanity, foreign from his heart, he added, that, as the punishment of death was not yet abolished, "I might, perhaps, vote for the infliction of that punishment at the conclusion of the war, because I think Louis Capet has deserved to die, and then the greatest danger

* Le Moniteur, du 20 Janvier. P. 100.

will be past;"—but he thought that a different punishment would be most conducive to the safety of the republic.

Quinette was a notary at Soissons, and a member both of the Legislative Assembly and of the National Convention;—he was a weak bad man; the creature of Lamarque, whose principles he adopted, and whose actions he imitated, with the most degrading servility.—He voted for the death of the King.

These commissioners, then, were traitors and regicides; they had been guilty of a murder the most atrocious, all circumstances considered, to be found in the melancholy annals of a nation's guilt. Mr. Fox and Mr. Sheridan had concurred in the general expressions of indignant reprobation which had burst forth, from every quarter of the kingdom, on the commission of the horrid deed. They had truly and strongly characterized it as equally inhuman, illegal, and unjust. Could it be denied, then, that the men who had perpetrated this deed, were assassins of the worst species, criminals of the deepest dye, wretches deserving of the severest punishment, and whom it was the duty of every man to bring to justice? A murderer is the general enemy of the human race; his blood is the forfeit attached to his crime by the fiat of the Almighty; and no

country, inhabited by man, should afford him a refuge. — The murderers in question were stamped with peculiar guilt; they had not even the unchristian plea of revenge to offer, nor yet the excuse of passion to urge, in extenuation of their infamy. — They were cold-blooded, calculating, metaphysical, philosophising, assassins, the premeditation of whose malice was the subject of their boast;—not men whose pitiful sophistry marked merely the perverted mind; but miscreants whose determined profligacy proved the corrupted heart.—Nor was their malignant rancour limited to one object; it extended to the whole race of Kings,* who were, therefore, called upon, in a peculiar manner, by a paramount principle of self-preservation, as well as by a sacred regard to justice, to put a stop to their guilty career.—Lord Auckland, then, only discharged an imperative duty, in exerting every effort to prevent such criminals from escaping the sword of the law. And it is a subject of regret, that there exists not some general law, some uni-

* Robert, one of the regicides, gave his vote for the murder of his Sovereign in these words,--- " I condemn the tyrant to die; and, in pronouncing this sentence, *I only regret that all tyrants are not within my power, that I might condemn them all to undergo the same punishment.*" — Le Moniteur, ubi Supra, P. 99.

versal compact, among nations, for carrying into effect the denunciations of the Almighty against murder; for inflicting condign punishment on the murderer, in whatever country he may be apprehended, the moment the requisite proof of his guilt can be obtained. As to that spurious philanthropy, of modern growth, which, while it condemns the *crime* protects the *criminal*, it is the bastard offspring of Philosophism, nursed by Faction, and reared in the School of Revolt.

At this period, the mercantile world were greatly alarmed by an unusual stagnation of trade, an extraordinary demand for money, and the refusal of the usual accommodation at the Bank in the discount of bills. These effects were chiefly produced by a boundless spirit of commercial enterprize, exceeding all ordinary means of support, and calling for a supply of capital within the power but of few to afford; and by a sudden diminution of orders from the foreign markets. It appeared, however, on examination, that great numbers were effected by the immediate want of credit, whose real property was amply sufficient to meet every want, and to satisfy every claim; but as this property could not, with adequate expedition, be converted into money; such persons were unable to answer the current demands upon

them, and were placed in a situation of equal distress with those who were really in a state of insolvency. Thus pressed, a committee of merchants waited on Mr. Pitt, to whom they represented the serious distress of the commercial world. Having closely investigated the subject, and being fully aware of the mischievous consequences of this temporary evil, if some effectual relief were not immediately afforded, Mr. Pitt introduced the business to the House of Commons, and a committee was accordingly appointed to take it into consideration.

On the 29th of April, the report was made to the House, which proved the causes of the prevailing distress to be such as have been above stated, and recommended the adoption of Mr. Pitt's plan of relief, which proposed to issue Exchequer bills to the amount of five millions sterling, to be entrusted to the management of commissioners, who were to advance it upon the credit of goods to be deposited in warehouses appropriated for their reception; which goods, if not redeemed before the first of May, 1794, were then to be sold. The interest to be paid upon the sums lent was at the rate of three pounds sixteen shillings per cent. The measure experienced some resistance from the opposition, who readily ascribed the

distress which called for it, to the war,—that fertile source of every evil, which seemed to associate itself, in their minds, with every measure of policy, and with every topic of discussion. It received, however, the sanction of the House, who passed the necessary act, in a few days; and the result established the wisdom of the application; for the relief granted fully answered every purpose;—credit was restored, trade increased, and commerce flourished, to the great improvement of the revenue, while not a sixpence was lost by the well-timed liberality of Parliament.

Mr. Grey, regardless of the admonitions of Mr. Pitt, in the preceding session, and deaf to the arguments which had been then pressed upon his attention, now brought forward his threatened plan of Parliamentary reform. The various petitions which had been presented to the House having been read, Mr. Grey, on the sixth of May, moved that they should be referred to a committee. — He prefaced his motion by a speech of some length, in which he stated that the principal abuses which rendered the proposed reform necessary, were the partiality and injustice of the representation, from a comparison of the population in the different places represented;— the interference of the aristocracy, the abuse of burgage tenures, and the

undue influence of the Crown through the Peerage. He expatiated on these different topics, and strongly deprecated the usual objections to motions of reform, founded on the alleged unseasonableness of the time. He insisted that no danger was now to be apprehended from the diffusion of French principles; as no Britons, who were not bereft of their senses, could, after recent events, propose the revolution in France as a model for the imitation of their own countrymen.—But, even if such danger were to be apprehended, the best means of averting it was the promotion of the comfort and happiness of the people, by the removal of existing abuses. Rejecting the conclusions of the disaffected in this country, who had considered Parliamentary Reform as a step advanced on the road to revolution, Mr. Grey considered that the adoption of reform was the surest mode of preventing a revolution. —In these sentiments Mr. Whitbread expressed his hearty concurrence;—he denied that metaphysical opinions had ever produced a revolution, which always, on the contrary, arose from the irritated feelings of the governed at the grinding oppression of the governors. This was the language of Brissot, and the very principle on which he founded his notable plan for raising the *governed* against the *governors*.

Mr. Whitbread contended, that the Reformation was not produced by the theories or speculations of philosophers; *but by the avarice and injustice of the Church of Rome.*—These were certainly the grand cause of the Reformation, though they would have been inadequate to produce it without other concurring circumstances, and among the most prominent of these must be reckoned the spirit of enquiry which had lately pervaded the greater part of Europe, and the introduction of the art of printing, which had greatly facilitated the acquisition of knowledge. To the oppressions of the government, he also imputed the murder of Charles the First—the Revolution of 1688—and the American rebellion. But this assertion only proved that Mr. Whitbread had obtained but a very superficial knowledge of those events, two of which were imputable to different causes; and the other, the Revolution of 1688, though owing to the misconduct of James the First, originated in the dread, which it inspired, of seeing the injustice, and the superstitious practices, of the Church of Rome restored, and, through that Church, arbitrary power introduced.

Mr. Pitt took occasion to deliver his sentiments on a subject which had long occupied a great share of his attention, in an early period of the debate. He considered the ques-

tion, being brought forward at that time, as involving the fate of all who had hitherto been so long protected by the British Constitution; nay, as involving the fundamental principles of every society, and of every form of government. The opinion which he had expressed in the late session had been confirmed by what afterwards occurred; and had even been strengthened by the petitions then on the table, and the motion then before the House. He had then considered the question as capable of producing much mischief, and likely to be attended with no good.—Such was the conclusion which he had drawn from experience. He had himself, on different occasions, proposed a reform, at periods which seemed favourable to his object, and supported by persons of the highest respectability, yet even then he had failed. Several, from a dread of the consequences of innovation, and from a doubt whether the advantages to be obtained would compensate for the risk to be incurred, opposed his views. If such arguments had formerly succeeded, what additional force had they last year acquired from the dreadful lesson afforded in a neighbouring kingdom? The scene of horror which it then presented, exceeded imagination, far short, as it stopped, of what had since occurred. He perceived, within the bosom of the country, a

small, but not contemptible, party forming, who aspired to more than a moderate reform, whose object, indeed, was nothing less than to introduce into England those French principles, which, from their consequences, he could not regard but with horror. He saw, therefore, that while none of that good of which a moderate reform might be productive was to be obtained, much danger might be incurred, and an opening afforded to wicked persons, to subvert that very constitution which he, and those who thought with him, were desirous to improve, only in order to preserve it; or, though the attempt to reform might not be attended with the total subversion of the constitution, yet it might lead to a state of confusion and distraction, which would, at least, disturb the enjoyment of existing blessings. He thus found the probability of good but little, while the mischief was of a size so gigantic as to exceed calculation.—And, upon this reasoning, even if he had rated as high as ever the advantages of a reform, and had seen a greater probability than had hitherto appeared of accomplishing it, he would rather have abandoned his object than have increased or incurred the danger. He would rather forego, for ever, the advantages of reform, than risk, for a moment, the existence of the British

Constitution. Besides, he considered the necessity of a reform, in consequence of circumstances which had since occurred, to be much less than when he brought forward his original motion.

But how, Mr. Pitt asked, was the question argued on the other side? The danger which he stated was not denied;—but it was alleged, that this was the very time for a moderate reform, it being the best means to quiet violent spirits, and the surest remedy against ruinous innovation. No doubt those who now brought forward the question entertained hopes of producing this good effect. He had learned, from their publications, that they not only proposed to guide the minds of the people, but also to be guided by them, and that they were resolved to give up their views if they should find that they did not meet with a pretty general concurrence.

Having taken this retrospective view of the question, as it stood in the last session, Mr. Pitt proceeded to inquire what had passed since. —And he here entered his protest against the prohibition to introduce the subject of French affairs, which he considered as intimately, essentially, and inseparably, connected with the question. Another year had now passed in France, disgraced with excesses and outrages so

horrid, that they effaced the memory of preceding enormities, and left nothing more of them than the faint traces, and the image, hardly visible. The conduct of the French, in all its circumstances, bore a peculiar application to this country; it presented the fruits, opening in due season, the legitimate offspring of those trees, which, under the specious pretext of liberty, had been planted for the purpose of destroying Great Britain and her allies. The French had disclosed a system of disseminating their principles, and of procuring proselytes in every part of Europe—a system which they had particularly followed up with respect to this country.—Such was the case without;—what was the situation of affairs within? — Societies had been formed in this country, affiliated with the Jacobin Clubs in France; and, though they had since assumed a different shape, they were then employed in the diffusion of jacobinical principles. In the pursuit of this object, they proceeded with a degree of boldness and confidence, proportioned to the success of the French arms. The Parliament thus beheld the scheme which they had anticipated, as the result of the new constitution in France, unfolding itself. They had, more immediately, the opportunity of seeing what were the views of the Legislators in France in

relation to this country, and what their instruments in England were endeavouring to effect. For, while in France, they always urged the pretext of a Parliamentary Reform, as the medium by which they were to introduce their principles; their instruments here always took care to connect the system of Parliamentary Reform with all those delusive doctrines, upon which was founded the newly-raised fabric of French freedom.—Nothing less than a National Convention was held out as a sufficient remedy for the abuses which prevailed in the representation, and as the sole organ through which a *more perfect form of government* was to be obtained; by which was meant, such a government as should acknowledge no other source of authority, and no other rule of conduct, than the will of the majority.—In short, French principles were inculcated as the true standard of political belief, and the example of the French government was proposed as a worthy object of imitation.

Tracing this spirit of disaffection, and these proceedings, from their origin to the present moment, Mr. Pitt continued to observe, that the former, which had been thus raised, was happily kept under, and prevented from breaking out into action, by the seasonable interference of the Legislature, by the vigilance

and exertions of the executive power, by the loyalty, vigour, and unanimity, of the people, and likewise by the interposition of Providence, in the turn lately given to affairs on the Continent, and the check experienced by the French arms. The admirers and supporters of French policy felt a depression of spirits from the defeat of their friends and allies, which, for a time, gave a fatal blow to their hopes, and compelled them to conceal their views, and to assume a veil of caution, but ill-suited to the ardour of their temper, and the boldness of their enterprize. But, though they had thus been forced for a while to relinquish their schemes, it was not thence to be inferred that they had by any means abandoned them;—no; they still indulged the same hopes, they still meditated the same plans, and only lay by to watch for an opportunity favourable to the accomplishment of their designs. For that purpose, they had looked peculiarly to the question of Parliamentary Reform. Previous to the introduction of the present motion, a great number of petitions had been presented to the House, equally singular in their form, in expression, and in the manner in which they had been submitted to notice.—They had been introduced under the auspices of Mr. Grey, by whom the motion was made.—They were of

three descriptions, except that one on which the motion was more particularly founded, and a petition from Nottingham, conceived in exactly the same terms with one which had been presented from the same place in 1782. At that period, it came after a long war, which had harassed and exhausted the country, and the calamities of which it stated as a proper ground for a reform of Parliament;—unfortunately, it still employed the same language, and gave the same description of the country, after a long and prosperous peace. All these petitions came either from England or from Scotland, or from places in England and Scotland, which seemed to have no natural connection, or likelihood of communication. Yet, coming from these different places, they were all the same in substance, and nearly the same in style;—whatever little difference there might be in the expression, they seemed all to proceed from the same hands——

——————Facies non omnibus una,
Nec diversa tamen; qualem decet esse sororum.

They all, it must be confessed, betrayed a strong family likeness. Almost the only difference was, that those from Scotland expressed their surprize at the immense load of

debt, notwithstanding the extent of the taxes, which they stated at twenty millions—four millions above the truth.—All of them were the same in prayer; they concurred in praying for the right of universal suffrage, as the basis of that reform which they were solicitous to obtain.

Two questions arose on these petitions; first, what weight they ought to have with the House, and how far they ought to be allowed to influence their judgment?—and, secondly, whether that was a season proper for the consideration of the object which they claimed, and favourable to a temperate reform? On the first point, when petitions came to the House, fabricated in appearance, similar in substance and expression, it did not require much time to determine in what point of view they were to be considered. There was every reason to suspect, that they were the work of a few individuals; they had much more the appearance of such, than of the general expression of the sentiments of the country. If it were asked, then, what weight they ought to have?—The answer was easy:—None.—The fraud was too gross and palpable; and it was evident from what quarter they came, and with what views they were promoted. All the circumstances in France, and in this country, pointed

out the present as a season unfavourable to temperate reform. The gentlemen who supported the motion, had been engaged in a society for the purpose, as they themselves stated, of allaying the violence of those who might be misled by a blind rage for innovation,—and of enlightening the people with respect to the nature of their true claims. Such had been the objects which they had avowed at their outset; they had proposed to make a fair experiment, to allow the people of England a full opportunity for procuring a rational and moderate reform; and, if they should find that they could not succeed, and that the people should be disinclined to any plan of reform, and not disposed to prosecute the measures which they should recommend, they were then to abandon their purpose. They had now gone on, for more than a year, publishing, with a view to enlighten the minds of the people, using every means to promote their own influence, and, during all that time, they had not been able to make a convert of one man in England.—They had been obliged, at last, to come forward with a petition of their own, introduced to the House on the very day on which the debate was to take place. The other petitions, which united in the same demand of Parliamentary Reform, carried a suspicious and dangerous

appearance. Ought they not, then, consistently with those principles which they had originally avowed, to have stood forth, on that occasion, to have acknowledged their mistake, and to have declared their conviction, that the people of England were not desirous of a reform, to have abandoned their object in which they feared they could not succeed, and to have joined in opposing a reform which was not even desired, and which could not be granted, with any propriety, at the present moment, or even with a chance of advantage to those for whom it was demanded?

Mr. Pitt next proceeded to consider the grounds which had been now urged in support of the question. It was stated that, from the general burst of loyalty, evinced by the nation upon the first alarm, there was no reason to fear, that the people would pass beyond the bounds of discretion; and that no season could be more favourable for a temperate reform, than that in which they had so strongly testified their attachment to the established order of things, and their reluctance to tolerate any change. Of this temper the House had been recommended to take advantage.—But how stood the case?—The fact, he granted, was indeed true; but it was also true, that societies, in this country, had been anxiously seeking, not to obtain reform,

but to find cause for dissatisfaction; not to allay the violence of innovation, but to inflame discontent. Was it then from deference to that small party, actuated by such principles, and pursuing such a line of conduct, that the Parliament was to grant a reform; and not from respect to the great body of the people of England, animated by a spirit of the purest loyalty, and too much attached to the blessings of the constitution, and of the existing government, to wish to hazard them by a change? What then was the question at issue? It was the same question which was then at issue with the whole of Europe, which was contending for the cause of order, of justice, of humanity, of religion; in opposition to anarchy, to injustice, to cruelty, to infidelity. Mr. Pitt was persuaded, that ninety-nine in a hundred of the people of England were warm in these sentiments, were sensible of the security which they enjoyed for those blessings which flowed from our excellent constitution; and that, so far from wishing to touch it with an innovating hand, they were prepared to defend it against every attack. Were Parliament to yield, then, to the clamours of dissatisfaction and discontent, and to disregard the voice of satisfaction and gratitude? Were they, in order to gratify the caprice, or to soothe the insolence, of a

few disaffected persons, to neglect the benefit of the common body? Were they, at a moment of emergency, like that, when the great cause of all was at stake, to suspend their cares for the public welfare, and attend to the discussion of petty claims, and the redress of imaginary grievances? Were they, at such a moment, in order to please a few individuals, to hazard the consequence of producing alarm and distrust in the great body of the nation, now firm and united in the common cause?—This would, indeed, resemble the conduct of those who, at the moment when their citadel was besieged, should proceed to the discussion of points of difference, rather than attend to providing the means of defence.

The next ground alleged in defence of the motion, was, that this was a time of war, and that, from the situation of commercial credit, the country was in a state of alarm and distrust. These, Mr. Pitt regarded as very strange reasons for such a measure, and thought it rather unwise, while engaged in a war of defence against a foreign enemy, to hazard the consequences of any distraction at home. Then, adverting to the state of credit, which he imputed to extensive commerce, he remarked, the embarrassment could only be ascribed to the constitution, by making the constitution the cause of that extent

to which commerce had been carried. But it was with an ill grace, that this period, and this state of affairs, were urged as grounds for reform, by gentlemen who, in the preceding year, had stated, on the same occasion, the long duration of peace, and the high state of public prosperity, as their motives for calling the attention of the House to the subject. These were certainly novelties which required to be reconciled before such persons could make any pretensions to consistency of reasoning.

Mr. Pitt now went on to examine the precise nature of the motion itself.—Having supposed that its object was to refer to a committee of the House only *one* of the petitions on the table, Mr. Grey set him right by telling him, that it was meant to refer them all. He then observed, that his reasoning on the subject would be reduced within a narrow compass. Could the House think of referring to a committee the consideration of the measure of universal suffrage? The motion having been made for referring the prayers of the petitions, generally, without pointing out any specific plan of reform, it was evidently improper to enter upon the discussion. This mode of proceeding had a tendency to excite discontent, without affording the means of allaying it. Mr. Pitt said, that, though he had himself formerly

moved for a general enquiry, he was afterwards convinced, that it would be attended with no good effect, and he abandoned the motion. He became sensible, that there was no chance of obtaining any advantage, but by bringing forward a specific proposition. If he had thought so then, how much more must he be confirmed in the same opinion now?—If any object were proposed for deliberation, it ought to be a specific object. The contrary mode could only tend to perplex the discussion, and to render it productive of mischief.

Adverting to the manner of introducing the question to the House, Mr. Pitt gave Mr. Grey credit for having stated, fairly and candidly, that he did not bring it forward on the ground of right, but on that of expediency.—In this he concurred with him;—for, to talk of an abstract right of equal representation was absurd. It was to arrogate a right to one form of government, whereas Providence had accommodated the different forms of government to the different states of society in which they subsisted. There was one right for a Roman, another for an Athenian, and a third for a Lacedemonian; but, though the ground of general and abstract right had been disclaimed, the ground of expedience had been so enlarged as to embrace the mode of reasoning by which that

wild theory was supported. Mr. Grey had declared himself ready to adopt even universal suffrage — that mode which he approved the least,—rather than suffer the constitution to remain as it was. Mr. Pitt, so far differed with him, on this point, that he declared he would rather abandon what he conceived would be the best plan of reform, than risk the consequences of any hazard to the constitution, as it subsisted at present. Could he then embark in the same committee, with one who, while he rejected the only plan of reform, for which he had ever contended, was ready to embrace that which he himself deemed the worst? He avowed his alarm at the extent to which Mr. Grey had carried his object; and he could not help looking at the society of friends to the people with some degree of suspicion, in consequence of a letter which he had seen signed with that gentleman's name, addressed to the people of Sheffield. These people had so well benefited by those lessons of caution and moderation, which they received from their patrons, that they lately presented a petition to the House for Parliamentary Reform, conceived in such terms as rendered it improper to be received.—They early communicated to the friends of the people their plan for a Parliamentary Reform, by assembling a Convention of National Dele-

gates.—What was the answer to this communication? "On the plan which you have suggested we do not think it yet a fit time to deliberate.—In a more advanced stage it may become a proper subject of discussion." No Parliamentary reform would satisfy those by whom it was now solicited; they wanted not a Parliamentary reform for itself, but for something else, to which they looked forward. They considered it not as the end of their wishes, but only as means which might lead to their accomplishment.

But it had been said, that by refusing this reform, the House would act upon the same principle by which America had been lost. Mr. Pitt avoided the discussion of the means by which America had been dissevered from the parent state, but shewed that the two cases were totally different. In the one, specific relief had been demanded, and a definite object indicated with which the applicants pledged themselves to be satisfied; in the other, the House was desired to give what nobody asked, and to those who declared that, even if it were given, they would not be satisfied. They claimed that which could be resolved into nothing but a deduction from French principles—that which was termed the will of the majority, the will of the multitude. Before the motion could be assented to, the

House must be prepared to deliberate, whether it was right or not to grant individual suffrage? On that question, Mr. Pitt declared he was not prepared to deliberate; first, because it required no deliberation;—and, secondly, because he had deliberated long enough upon it already He had not been so inattentive to the passing occurrences in a neighbouring kingdom, nor had he been so unaffected by them, as not frequently to have taken this subject into consideration.

Mr. Pitt said, that his own plan went to give vigour and stability to the ancient principles of the constitution, and not to introduce into it any new principles. The merit of the British Constitution was to be estimated not by metaphysical ideas, not by vague theories, but by analysing it in practice: its benefits were confirmed by the sure and infallible test of experience. It was on this ground that the representation of the people, which must always be deemed a most valuable part of the constitution, rested on its present footing. In the history of England, from the earliest period to that time, the number of electors had always been few in proportion to the population of the country. His plan went to regulate the distribution of the right of electing members, to add some, and to transfer others; was he, then,

to be told, that he was an advocate for parliamentary reform, as if he had espoused the same side of the question which was now taken up by Mr. Grey and his friends, and was now engaged in resisting that cause which he had formerly supported? Mr. Pitt insisted that his plan was as contrary to that proposed by Mr. Grey, as Mr. Grey's plan was to the constitution, and he expressed his concurrence in the observation of Mr. Windham, that, to adopt the system now proposed, would be to adopt the principles of the French code, and to follow the example of the French legislators. As these principles were unknown in the history of this country, it was to France only that the House could look for their origin. The principle which claimed individual suffrage, and affirmed that every man had an equal right to a share in the representation, was the same which served as the basis of that declaration of rights on which the French legislators had professed to found their government. He reminded his audience that there were two hundred and fifty persons who possessed an equal voice in the legislature with the House of Commons; that there was a King who, to the third of the legislative, added the whole of the Executive, Power; and that, if this principle of individual suffrage were granted, and carried to its legitimate

extent, it went to subvert the peerage;—to depose the King;—in fine, to extinguish every hereditary distinction, and every privileged order;—and to establish that system of equalizing anarchy which was announced in the code of French legislation, and attested in the blood of the Parisian massacres.

The question then was, as Mr. Pitt stated it to be, whether the House would abide by the constitution, or hazard a change, with all that dreadful chain of consequences with which it had been attended in a neighbouring kingdom? If it were possible for an Englishman to forget his attachment to the constitution, and his loyalty to the Sovereign;—if it were possible for him to lose all those generous feelings which bound him to his country, and secured his obedience to its laws;—if it were possible for him to sacrifice all these to the principles which were brought forward to support a change of government; yet, if he would only attend to reason, he would find them wild and illusive theories.—He would find the principle of individual will powerful and efficient to the destruction of every individual, and of every community; but to every good purpose null and void. — He would find that those rights which entitled all to an equal share in the government, were rights which only served

to remove them from useful labour, from sober industry, and from domestic connections; and which abandoned them to be the slaves of every idle caprice, and of every destructive passion. The government which adopted such principles ceased to be a government; it loosed the bands which knit society together; it forfeited the reverence and obedience of its subjects; it gave up those, whom it ought to protect, to the daggers of the Marseillese, and the assassins of Paris. Under a pretence of centering all authority in the will of the many, it established the worst species of despotism. Such was the state of that wretched country, France, the detestable policy of which had added new words to the dictionary, such as the phrases of municipalities declaring themselves in a state of *permanent* revolution, and the nation itself in a state of *sovereign* insurrection!— In what was called the government of the multitude, they were not the many who governed the few, but the few who governed the many. It was a species of tyranny which added insult to the wretchedness of its subjects, by styling its own arbitrary decrees the voice of the people, and by sanctioning its acts of oppression and cruelty under the pretence of the national will. Such was the nature of those principles which were connected with the right of indi-

vidual suffrage; and it was for the House to determine how far it would give countenance to that measure, by referring it to the deliberation of a committee.

Mr. Fox and Mr. Sheridan were not satisfied with the Minister's explanation of the radical difference between his own plan of reform and that of Mr. Grey; and they accordingly persisted in charging him with inconsistency of principle, and versatility of conduct. They both supported Mr. Grey's motion and project; and Mr. Fox, in particular, justified his support, by the alleged inadequacy of the House of Commons, as at present composed, to the discharge of its important duties. He could, however, persuade only forty other members to coincide with him in his opinion of their own insufficiency, while two hundred and eighty-two concurred in the rejection of the motion.

The Session of Parliament now drew towards a close; legislative means having been adopted for the vigorous prosecution of the war, and for the preservation of domestic tranquillity, and all other measures taken which the public service required.— But Mr. Fox, seemingly intent only on one object, would not suffer the Parliament to be prorogued, without another effort to compel the Ministers to make

advances, equally premature, degrading, and fruitless, to the French regicides, for obtaining peace. Accordingly, on the 17th of June, he moved an address to his Majesty, requesting him to take the earliest measures for procuring peace with France, on terms consistent with the justice and policy of the British nation. The motion was strongly opposed by Mr. Windham and Mr. Burke, both of whom expatiated on the danger, as well as on the impolicy, of dissolving the existing confederacy against France, and the folly and degradation of an attempt at negotiation. Mr. Burke declared, that he, for one, would never consent to prostrate the Throne of Great Britain at the foot of the French Jacobins, or the French National Convention. The House, perfectly satisfied with the cogency of the arguments which had been advanced, both now and before, in opposition to Mr. Fox's pacific notions, called loudly for the question, but Mr. Pitt, having been personally alluded to by the opposition, felt it necessary to make some few observations on the general grounds on which it had been supported. It had doubtless been introduced on the eve of the conclusion of the Sessions, as a solemn expression of the sentiments entertained by Mr. Fox on the present state of affairs; and, therefore, Mr. Pitt was anxious

that his opinion upon the subject should be unequivocally stated. He declared, therefore, without hesitation, that the motion was in itself the most impolitic and preposterous which could possibly be adopted, the most contradictory to those general principles which ought, at all times, to regulate the conduct of Englishmen, and the most unsuitable to those particular circumstances in which they were then placed. It was only calculated to amuse and delude the people, by holding out to them a possibility of peace, when, in reality, peace was impossible, and thus served to create groundless discontents and dissatisfaction with the existing situation of affairs.—He then adverted to the objects of the war, and contended that not one of them could be secured by a premature application for peace.—He disclaimed all intention, before the war, of interfering with the internal affairs of France. But, having been attacked, no pledge either had, or could be given, that such interference would not take place.—If, indeed, sufficient reparation and security could be obtained without any alteration in the revolutionary government, then ought they to be accepted.—But he certainly thought, that the best security to be afforded, would be the destruction of that wild, ungoverned system, whence had resulted all

those injuries against which it had become necessary to guard.

Mr. Pitt next considered the practicability of making peace with the existing usurpers of the Supreme power in France; and he observed that, before a treaty could be concluded, in all probability, a change of men would occur, and a change of measures ensue, which might stop it in its progress; or, should it be concluded, the same cause might lead to its immediate violation. Should they treat with Marat, before the negotiation was finished, he might again have descended to the dregs of the people, from which he had sprung, and have given place to a still more desperate villain. A band of leaders had swayed the mob in constant succession, all resembling in guilt, but each striving to improve in crime upon his predecessor, and swell the black catalogue with new modes and higher gradations of wickedness.—

> Ætas parentum pejor avis tulit
> Nos nequiores, mox daturos
> Progeniem vitiosiorem.

No treaty, he contended, could exist on their good faith, independent of the terms of peace; and no engagement could be formed more solemn than that which the French rulers had contracted

in return for the acknowledged neutrality of the British government, and which they had so scandalously violated.

Having shewn that the motion could answer no *good* purpose, he proceeded to prove that it was calculated to answer a very bad purpose—to discourage our allies, and to inspire our enemies with confidence. It was negatived, on a division, by 187 votes against 47.

On the twenty-first of June his Majesty prorogued the Parliament, remarking in his speech, that it was only by a vigorous prosecution of the war that he could hope to obtain the great end to which his views were uniformly directed—the restoration of peace on such terms as might be consistent with the permanent security of this country, and with the general tranquillity of Europe.

CHAPTER XXVII.

Affairs of France—State of that Country after the murder of the King—Character of Louis XVI. by M. de. Malesherbes—Schism among the Jacobins—Brissot heads the Girondists, and Robespierre takes the command of the Jacobins—Advantage of the latter over the former—Extraordinary means adopted for reinforcing the Armies—Siege of Maestricht raised—French driven out of Liege—Discontent in the Austrian Netherlands—Dumouriez resumes the command of the French Army—Endeavours to restore Discipline and to check Extortion—Attacks the Austrians at Nerwinde—Is defeated with great loss—Again defeated at Louvain—Retreats towards the French frontier—Comparative force of the two Armies—Dumouriez opens a negotiation with the Austrians—His interview with Colonel Mack—His scheme for dissolving the Convention, and for restoring the Constitutional Monarchy—Mack insists on the evacuation of the Austrian Netherlands by the French—Dumouriez accedes to the proposal and withdraws his Army—Commissioners from the Convention order Dumouriez to repair to Paris—He refuses, seizes the Commissioners, and delivers them up to the Austrians—Publishes a Proclamation inviting all loyal Frenchmen to join him—Is fired at by a body of National Guards—Flies to the Austrian Quarters—The Prince de Cobourg, at his request, addresses a Proclamation to the

French—Dumouriez returns to his Camp—Defection of his Troops—He quits the Camp and joins the Austrians—Is joined by 1500 of his men—The Austrian Commander recalls his Proclamation, and declares the Armistice at an end—His conduct justified—Causes of the inactivity of the Austrians at this period—Dampierre takes the command of the French Army and attacks the Allies—He is defeated and killed—Is succeeded by Custine—An English Army joins the Austrians—The Allies drive the French from the fortified Camp of Famars—Lay siege to Valenciennes—Vigorous measures of the Convention for arming and training the whole population of France—The Allies force the strong position of Cæsar's Camp—Division of the allied Army—Duke of York forms the siege of Dunkirk—The covering Army defeated—Siege raised—Quesnoi taken by the Austrians—The Austrians forced to raise the siege of Maubeuge—State of things at the close of the Campaign in Flanders—Operations on the Rhine—Mentz reduced by the Prussians—The lines of Weissemberg forced by the Prussians---Surrender of Toulon to Lord Hood—Military Operations—Superiority of the French---Evacuation of Toulon—Massacre of the Loyalists—Account of Ships captured and destroyed—Name of Toulon changed to *Port-Mountain*---Reduction of the French Settlements in the East Indies by the British—Capture of Tobago—Internal affairs of France—Struggles between the Jacobins and Girondists—Brissot's Address to his Constituents—A true picture of France—Arts of the Girondists turned against themselves—Camille Desmoulin's answer to Brissot---His Birth, Character, and Conduct—His concern with the Massacres of September—Means taken for the destruction of the Girondists—They are put under arrest—The system of terror established—Persecution of Foreigners—Mr. Pitt declared, by the Convention, to be an enemy of the

human race—The right of assassinating him referred to the consideration of a Committee—Erection of a Revolutionary Tribunal—Trial and Murder of the Queen of France—The Dauphin consigned to the care and instruction of Simon, a Cobler—Vindication of the Queen's Character by the absence of all proof against her—Trial of Brissot and his associates—Interference of the Jacobin Club to abridge the proceedings---Decree of the Convention for that purpose---The Brissotins condemned and executed---Trial of Camille Desmoulins---His blasphemous answer to the Judges---His Execution---Execution of Le Brun---Madame Roland---Barnave---and Bailli.

[1793.] By the murder of Louis the Sixteenth a deep stain was inflicted on the national character of France, which not all the enormities that followed that dreadful event can efface; and a lasting impression made on the minds of surrounding people which centuries of expiation and atonement will scarcely suffice to remove. The Monarch, whom philosophising rebels had consigned to the scaffold, was a just, a merciful, and pious Prince, abounding in virtue, but, unhappily, deficient in energy and decision of character: his faults proceeded from the excess of his virtuous feelings; his aversion from acts of severity, and his abhorrence from the effusion of human blood, led him to encourage rebellion by forbearance to adopt the necessary means of repression on the first manifestation of a rebellious spirit;—and to become

the unintentional instrument of producing the destruction of millions, by refusing to sign the necessary order for repelling, by force, the earliest efforts of treachery and revolt. M. de Malesherbes, his venerable defender, ably pourtrayed the character of this persecuted Sovereign, and the cause of the revolution which occasioned his death, in an eloquent burst of virtuous indignation, on receiving the fatal intelligence from the Abbè Edgeworth, who repaired from the scaffold to his house.—"And it was in the name of the *nation*," exclaimed the agonized advocate, "that the villains perpetrated this parricide—in the name of the French, who, had they been worthy of so good a King, would have acknowledged him to be the best they ever had.—Yes, the very best; for he was as pious as Louis IX. as just as Louis XII. as humane as Henry IV. and exempt from all their failings. His only fault was that he loved us too well; thence conducting himself too much as our father, and too little as our King; and constantly labouring to procure for us more happiness than we were capable of enjoying. But *his* faults proceeded, in some degree, from his virtues,—whereas *ours* flow entirely from our vices. He justly imputed the destruction in which the nation was involved, to that spurious philosophy which had invaded every class, and by which, he acknowledged, he

had himself been led astray. It was that which had, as it were by magic, fascinated the eyes of the nation, and made them sacrifice the substance to the shadow.—To the mere words *political liberty,* France had sacrificed *social liberty*, which she possessed in a greater degree, according to M. de Malesherbes, than any other nation, because she had multiplied and embellished the sources of enjoyment more than any other nation. The people, conscious of being completely invested with the liberty of doing every thing which the law permitted, conceived that political liberty conferred the right of doing what the law forbade, and thence France was inundated with crimes. Intoxicated with the idea of their sovereignty, they imagined that, by overthrowing the monarchy, they should place themselves upon the throne; that by promoting the confiscation of the property of the rich, they should transfer it to their own hands. Wretches who were most eager in the diffusion of such absurd notions unfortunately were sent, as representatives, to the National Assembly; and their first efforts were directed against their Sovereign.*

This is a just picture, as far as it goes; abstract terms unintelligible to the multitude, even more ignorant in France than in most other countries, had bewildered their imaginations,

* Bertrand's Private Memoirs. Vol. III. p. 279, 280

inflamed their passions, inflated their vanity, and betrayed them into the commission of enormities which their uninformed and perverted minds regarded as necessarily flowing from the new principles which they had been so industriously taught. The question, indeed, arguing abstractedly, was not precisely what M. de Malesherbes stated it to be,—whether the people of France were allowed to do whatever the law did not forbid? but whether the law permitted them to do what was essential to the enjoyment of rational freedom? The conceptions of the people, however, he accurately described, as well as the consequences to which they led.—With equal truth he observed, that all the efforts of the traitors to debase their Sovereign had been vain. His steady virtue had triumphed over their wickedness.—Malesherbes advised Mr. Edgeworth instantly to leave Paris, and to fly from an accursed land, which could afford him no refuge from the Tigers, who thirsted for his blood.* But he vainly flattered himself, that his popularity would secure his own grey hairs from their rage—as if the fury of tigers would *discriminate!*—His attachment to his King was never forgiven nor forgotten; and, three years after, at the age of seventy-five, he was con-

* Idem. Ibid. P. 281.

signed to the scaffold, on a vague charge of conspiring against that *sovereignty of the people*, the evil effects of which he now so pathetically deplored; and his whole family was involved in the same sanguinary and merciless proscription.

After the death of the King, the division which had long subsisted between the different sections of the Jacobins, but which a sense of common interest, and the pursuit of one common object, had combined to conceal, became manifest, decided, and avowed. The Girondists ranged themselves under Brissot, while Robespierre placed himself at the head of the rest.—The former were superior in talents, the latter in energy; and, in this stage of the revolution, it was easy to perceive, that the men who would *act*, must speedily prevail over those who could *talk*;* but who could do little else. The Jacobins, too, had other important advantages over their opponents.—The bands of federalists, who had been called by the Girondists to Paris, to protect their persons, and to second their measures, had been sent to the frontiers; and the whole armed force of Paris, together with all that bore the name and sem-

* Danton, one of the furious leaders of the Jacobins, emphatically observed, at a subsequent period, "*Il nous faut des travaux, et non pas des discours.*"

balance of civil power, remained at the perfect disposal of the Jacobins, who, intent on the removal of every impediment to the attainment of supreme authority, and unrestrained by any one principle of religion, morals, or law, were fully resolved to employ it with effect, whenever a suitable opportunity should occur.

While the last grand struggle between these revolutionary rivals was pending, means were taken to strengthen the armies on the frontiers, and to provide for their subsistence.—All the male population of the country, between the ages of eighteen and forty, being unmarried, were put in requisition, and reams of assignats were issued for their support. After offensive operations had been unexpectedly renewed by the Austrian General, Clerfayt, the Prince of Saxe-Cobourg took the command of that army, improved the advantages already gained, defeated the French with great loss, on the fifth of March, in the neighbourhood of Aix la Chapelle, and drove them back, in confusion, to Liege; while the Prussians, under Prince Frederick of Brunswick, gained a victory on the same day, at Bruggen, which made them masters of the whole course of the Lower Meuse. Miranda, who, on the news of these defeats, had hastily raised the siege of Maestricht, was driven, by the Archduke Charles, from a position which

ne had taken for the defence of Liege; and the Austrians, continuing to advance, drove the French army, in a few days, from the Roer to the Dyle, and so rescued, from their plunder and oppression, the Duchies of Guelders, Juliers, and Limburg, with the principalities of Liege and Stavelo.

These successes of the allies gave courage to the oppressed inhabitants of the Austrian Netherlands, who had experienced the promised blessings of French fraternity, in the violation of domestic privacy, in the plunder of their churches, in the subversion of their laws, in the destruction of their usages and customs, in the seizure of their property, and in a forced acquiescence, in revolutionary proceedings, which excited, at once, their contempt and their abhorrence.* Thus, when Dumouriez found himself

* For a particular account of the systematized tyranny of the French in the Netherlands, see the very curious historical and political memoirs of the revolution in Belgium and Liege, by Publicola Chaussard, one of the commissioners, sent by the Convention, to revolutionize those countries.—Some idea of the brutal manner, in which the feelings of the people were insulted by these agents of the French Regicides, may be formed, from the following note, addressed by this Chaussard to the municipality of Liege.—" I present to you, magistrates " of the people, two free beings; they have promised love and " marriage to each other; they wish to ratify this promise, not " at the knees of the priest, but before the sacred altar of the " law, THE ONLY DIVINITY OF FREEMEN.

obliged to evacuate Holland, in order to take the command of the army in the Low Countries, he found all the people anxious to exterminate the French; while his own troops were scattered in every direction, and most of them had fled beyond the enemy's territory.

The first step taken by Dumouriez was to annul all the decrees, sentences, and proceedings of the civil commissioners; while, regardless alike of their intreaties, and their threats, he peremptorily ordered all the church plate, which had not yet been destroyed, to be restored; and, in short, did every thing in his power to repair the evils which had been committed.—After rallying the fugitives, he found himself at the head of fifty thousand men, besides as many more in the fortresses of Holland, which he still retained, in the different towns of the

"Magistrates, receive their promise, be the priests of "nature. Marriage is a civil contract, which, like all other "acts, results, solely, from the will of the contracting par-"ties. The laws of France have, agreeably to reason, "declared this to be the fact. You are Frenchmen by adop-"tion, and the parties are French. Magistrates of a free "people, bless, proclaim, this union; and let that place, "which has hitherto been the workshop of fanaticism, become "the sanctuary of philosophy."—P. 107.

In writing to his brother commissaries at Brussels, he announces this insult to religion as "a victory gained over fanaticism."

Netherlands, and on the frontiers of the Ardennes.—Well acquainted with the temper and character of the French soldiers, ever impetuous in attack, but feeble in defence, he resolved to lead his troops against the enemy. Having encouraged them, by some trivial advantages obtained at Tirlemont, and in the vicinity, about the middle of March, he brought them to a general action on the eighteenth. The battle of Nerwinde was long and obstinately contested; but the steady discipline, and cool intrepidity of the Austrians, under General Clerfayt, who was immediately opposed to the main division of the enemy, led by Dumouriez in person, at length prevailed over the superior numbers of the French, who were driven from the field, at the close of the day, with great slaughter. Four thousand soldiers, and a number of officers, slain, with three and thirty pieces of cannon taken, were the reward of the conqueror, who, pursuing his advantage, attacked the French again, on the twenty-second of March, in the neighbourhood of Louvain, and, after an obstinate conflict, again defeated them with similar loss.

Dumouriez, being thus driven from his entrenched camp, on the heights, in front of Louvain, retreated beyond Brussels, while the Prince of Saxe Cobourg continued to advance,

and fixed his camp at a short distance from that town. The Austrian army, at this time, consisted but of thirty thousand men, a force very inferior to that of the French, notwithstanding their recent disasters, and their numerous desertions. It would have been highly imprudent, therefore, for the Austrians to advance further, until they should be joined by the Prussian division, under Prince Frederick of Brunswick, and by some battalions of infantry, and squadrons of horse, which were on their march towards the scene of action.

At this period, Dumouriez dispatched one of his aids-de-camp to the Prince of Saxe Cobourg, to inform him that he had resolved to put an end to all the calamities which afflicted his country, to restore the constitutional royalty, to dissolve the National Convention, and to punish the Parisian regicides;—and the General expressed his wish, that some confidential person might be sent to him by the Prince, to whom he could explain his intentions more at large. Colonel Mack, Adjutant-General to the Austrian army, was accordingly sent to Dumouriez, who had transferred his head-quarters to Ath, and encamped his troops behind the Dendre. There the colonel had a private conference with him, to which were admitted General Thouvenot, Lieutenant-General Valence,

and some other principal officers of the French army. Dumouriez opened the business, by observing, that he could no longer be a passive spectator of all the enormities committed in France, that he was determined to disperse the criminal Convention, to re-establish the Constitutional Monarchy, to rescue the Queen and the Dauphin, and to proclaim the latter King; but, in order to enable him to accomplish this plan with safety, it would be necessary that the Prince of Cobourg should engage not only to let him remain quiet in his present position behind the Dendre, but to afford him every assistance which he might require. Colonel Mack, aware, that if Dumouriez's attempt upon the French government should fail, that General might return to the Netherlands, to attack the Austrians, observed, in a tone of decision, that the Prince of Cobourg would enter upon no negotiation whatever, so long as a single French soldier should remain in the Netherlands; and that, before any further proceedings were had, it would be indispensably necessary that Dumouriez should evacuate not only the open country, but also the cities of Namur and Antwerp, and the fortresses of Breda and Gertruydenberg, which were still occupied by his troops. Colonel Mack supported this proposal by an exaggerated account

of the Austrian force, which he represented as capable of making head against Dumouriez's army, and of sparing sufficient to cut off the retreat of the French from Holland.—After a short pause, Dumouriez remarked, that the Low Countries had always been the prey of a single battle; that he had fought two, and had had the misfortune to lose both;—he would, therefore, consent to return to the frontiers of France, and to issue orders for the evacuation of all the fortified places without delay. In return for which he was assured by Mack, that the Prince of Cobourg would not pursue him beyond the frontier, but would remain a quiet, though attentive, observer of his operations at Paris, until Dumouriez should require his assistance.—Dumouriez faithfully fulfilled his promise; he completely evacuated Holland, and the Austrian Netherlands, and withdrew his army within the frontier of France.

The evening before Dumouriez left Tournay, he requested a second interview with Mack, at which he informed him, that commissioners from the Convention had arrived at Lille, bringing with them a decree of that Assembly, ordering him to appear at their bar; but that he meant to have the miscreants apprehended, and delivered up to the Austrians; after which he would immediately prepare for

his march to Paris, his army being perfectly of the same opinion with himself. The day after this interview, Dumouriez withdrew his army into his two entrenched camps of Maulde and Brüil, and fixed his head-quarters at St. Amand; while the Austrians advanced to Mons and Tournay.—And, two days after these movements, the four commissioners from the French Convention, with Bournonville, the Minister of War, who had accompanied them, were seized, and sent in custody to the Austrian head-quarters. Dumouriez immediately issued a proclamation, expressive of his resolution to dissolve the Convention, and to restore the Constitutional Monarchy, and calling on all loyal Frenchmen to join him.*

Dumouriez, however, soon found that the confidence which he had reposed in his army was groundless, and that his hopes of their concurrence in his views were vain.—Indeed, it is difficult to discover the grounds on which any man of sense and experience could place reliance on the attachment of troops who had proved faithless to their oaths, and rebels to their Sovereign. As the general was riding out with his staff, he met a battalion of

* This proclamation, which is dated St. Amand, April 2, 1793, is inserted among the State Papers in Rivington's Annual Register for that year.—P. 303.

National Guards, who had left their quarters, and were marching towards Valenciennes; and when he enquired whither they were going, was answered by a discharge of musquetry, and, with difficulty, effected his escape to the Austrian frontier, where he joined Colonel Mack. Still he was unwilling to believe that his army would forsake him, and he imputed this accident, as he termed it, to the insidious insinuations of certain commissioners who had arrived at Valenciennes from Paris, and who had made the soldiers believe that he intended to sell his country to the enemy. In order to remove this impression, and to tranquillize the minds of his troops, he earnestly conjured the Prince of Cobourg to send him a number of proclamations, signed by himself, confirming the statement which Dumouriez himself had published of his object and designs. After remaining with Mack till three in the morning, he ventured to return to his camp, where he was received with every expression of joy; while Mack reported, to the Commander in Chief of the Austrian army the result of this second interview.

The Prince of Cobourg did not hesitate to comply with Dumouriez's request, and the desired proclamation was accordingly for-

warded to the General the next evening.* But no time was allowed to give it effect; for that very day the cannoniers declared that they would quit the camp, and repair to Valenciennes;---their example was followed by several battalions of National Guards, and when Dumouricz called on the troops of the line to compel them to do their duty, these declared, that although they were disposed to march with him to Paris, for the purpose of restoring the constitution of 1789, they would never direct their arms against their countrymen and companions in arms. Dumouricz now plainly perceived that he was no longer safe among such troops, and he, accordingly, left the camp and the country, on the night of the fifth of April, accompanied by several generals and other officers. About fifteen hundred or two thousand troops of the line followed their general; the rest of the army hastily quitted the entrenched camps; and, while some of them threw themselves into Condè, Valenciennes, and Maubeuge, others fled in various directions, and returned to their homes. The Prince of Cobourg lost no time in occupying these advantageous posts, and in forming the blockade of Condè, which was ill

* This proclamation was dated Mons, April 5.—See Rivington's Annual Register.—P. 309*.

supplied with provisions.* During these transactions, a Congress was held at Antwerp, at which the future plan of operations against France was settled; and at which Lord Auckland, the British Minister at the Hague, attended. As the late proclamation of the Prince of Cobourg was issued in consequence of the agreement entered into with Dumouriez, the moment that agreement ceased to have effect, by the inability of one of the contracting parties to enforce it, the other was, of necessity, released from all the engagements into which he had entered, and from all the conditions which he had subscribed. Before, however, the renewal of hostilities, the Prince of Cobourg issued another proclamation, on the ninth of April,† announcing to the French the revocation of his former proclamation, and the cessation of the armistice. Thus the allied powers were placed, in respect of the French, in precisely the same situation in which they stood, previous to the commencement of the negotiation with Dumouriez. They had to

* This brief statement of facts relative to the negotiations between Dumouriez and the Austrians, is taken from an account of the transaction written by Colonel Mack at the time.

† Inserted in Rivington's Annual Register for 1793.—P. 309.

engage an enemy, who had, without provocation, and for the basest of purposes, wantonly declared war against them, threatening not merely to lay waste their countries, but to subvert their thrones. Though the war was no common war, nor to be carried on by ordinary means, still, if the combined powers chose so to consider it, and so to wage it, however by so doing they might defeat their own object, yet would their conduct be sanctioned by every rule of justice, and by every principle of self-defence.

The allies have been inconsiderately censured for their inactivity at this critical juncture, when they might have availed themselves of the confusion consequent on the desertion of Dumouriez, to cut off the flying and insulated detachments of the French army. But the fact was, that the Austrians were so ill provided for any important operation, that they had not a single piece of battering cannon, nor even a sufficient number of troops, in the month of April, to undertake a siege; and they did not expect to receive either till the middle of May.* They were, therefore, unable

* On the eighth of April, Colonel Mack thus described the Austrian army: "N'ayant pas une seule piéce de siege, et rien moins qu'un nombre suffisant de troupes pour pouvoir l'entreprendre, et n'ayant pas l'espoir d' avoir ni l'un ni l'autre avant six semaines," &c.

to prevent Dampierre, the successor of Dumouriez, from collecting the scattered remnants of the army, and encamping at Bouchain. With a due knowledge of the character of the French soldier, the new commander sought to encourage his troops by the renewal of offensive operations. On three different days, between the 30th of April and the 10th of May, he attacked the position of the allies, between the Schieldt and the Scarpe, but he was defeated each time, and, in the last attack, on the 10th of May, he lost his life, and was succeeded by Custine, who was called from the Rhine, to take the command of the Northern Army.

The Austrians having at length received their long-expected reinforcements, and being joined by a considerable body of English, under the Duke of York, became assailants in their turn, and, on the twenty-third of May, after an obstinate contest, drove the French from the heights of Famars and of Anzin, which they had strongly fortified, for the better protection of the important fortress of Valenciennes. The siege of Valenciennes was then commenced in form, while Condè was more closely invested. Subdued by famine, the garrison of this latter place surrendered on the 10th of July, and, on the first of August, the commander of the former capitulated, and opened its gates to the

allies. The republican troops, in the mean time, had made various incursions into West Flanders, where they gathered some plunder, but no laurels; being every where beaten, and driven back with considerable loss.

Undismayed by these disasters, and resolved to secure their ill-gotten power, at all hazards, the rulers of France had recourse to a desperate expedient for overpowering their enemies, the adoption of which at once proved the extent of their own authority, and the abject state of slavery to which the people were already reduced. They first seized upon all the church bells, to be converted into cannon, leaving only one for each parish; and afterwards, on the twenty-first of August, the Convention passed a decree by which the whole population of France was devoted to military purposes, and the whole country converted into one vast camp. Commissioners were sent into the provinces to superintend the execution of this decree, which was further enforced by every means which could inspire terror, or compel obedience. Five hundred thousand men, or rather boys, were thus raised in a short time, and were first sent into the garrison towns to relieve the troops of the line, who were forwarded to the different armies. As another means of securing victory to their arms, it was resolved to consider every

defeat as a proof of treachery; and, in conformity with this resolution, Custine, and others, were consigned to the guillotine.

After the French were driven from the heights of Famars, they occupied the strong position called Cæsar's Camp, between Bouchain and Cambray, which, however, they evacuated in the most cowardly manner, on the approach of the allies.—The facility with which the French had been repulsed, probably, was one of the motives which induced the allies to adopt the unfortunate resolution of dividing their forces, and of besieging, at the same time, both Dunkirk and Quesnoy. The Duke of York, who commanded the division designed for the former of these services, began his march, towards the scene of his destined operations, on the eighteenth of August, and, after some fighting, particularly at *Lincelles*, where the guards, under General Lake, acquired great honour, arrived in the vicinity of Dunkirk, defeated the French force there collected, and sate down before the town. It has been supposed, that if, immediately after this defeat, the British commander had followed up his advantage, and attempted to take the town by assault, he would have succeeded in the attempt. Certain it is, that, at this moment, it was but ill-provided against such an attack; the

garrison was small; no confidence prevailed among the troops; and all was doubt, hesitation, and fear. Ample time, however, was afforded for remedying these evils, and for supplying these defects.—While the necessary preparations for a formal siege were carrying on, the garrison was strongly reinforced, a resolute commander appointed, and a strong force collected for the purpose of attacking the army under Field-Marshal Freytag, which was destined to cover the siege. This force, led on by Houchard, attacked the allies on the sixth of September, and, breaking their line, compelled them to retreat; while the garrison of Dunkirk made a vigorous sortie on the besieging army, and were not repulsed without great difficulty, and no small loss.—On the eighth of September, the French made another attack on the covering army, which, after great slaughter on both sides, was ultimately obliged to retire to the neighbourhood of Furnes.—His troops being now exposed to a double attack from the garrison in front, and from the army in his rear, the Duke of York was reduced to the necessity of abandoning the siege, and he effected his retreat with great precipitation and considerable loss.

The Austrians, however, on their side, succeeded in reducing the fortress of Quesnoy,

and in gaining important advantages over the troops which were sent to its relief. They then laid siege to Maubeuge; but the French, under General Jourdan, attacked them in their trenches, on the 15th of October, and, after sustaining a great loss, forced them to raise the siege. Various incursions were afterwards made by the French into Maritime Flanders, but, unable to establish a footing there, they were compelled, once more, reluctantly, to retire within their own frontier.—The fruits of the campaign, in this quarter, were the acquisition of Valenciennes, Condè, and Quesnoy, by the allies.—On the Rhine, the Republicans were not more successful.—Mentz, after a long and obstinate defence, surrendered to the Prussians. The French were driven by the Austrians, with great slaughter, from the lines of Weissembourg, on the thirteenth of October;—and on several other points, where they were the assailants, they were uniformly repulsed.

During these military operations on the Northern frontiers of France, the Southern provinces had evinced the strongest disapprobation of the new order of things;—and Lyons, Marseilles, and Toulon, had openly raised the standard of royalty. The first of these cities made a most gallant stand; and did not open her gates to the ferocious republicans till

four and twenty thousand of them were destroyed; and till she had lost the bravest of her defenders in the sanguinary conflict. On the ninth of October, the Conventional troops took possession of the city, and, in return for their heroic defence, murdered, in cold blood, thousands of her inhabitants. Marseilles experienced a similar fate, to avoid which, the inhabitants of Toulon invited Lord Hood, who commanded the British fleet in the Mediterranean, to take possession of the city and port, in trust for Louis the Seventeenth. His Lordship entered the harbour on the twenty-eighth of August; and soon after Lord Mulgrave took the command of the forces destined for the defence of this important place, and which consisted of British, Spaniards, Neapolitans, and Piedmontese.—Unfortunately, however, no adequate means of resisting the powerful army, sent to reduce it, were provided, and, after keeping possession of it for nearly four months, during which time the troops were greatly harassed by the incessant attacks of the enemy, it was finally evacuated on the eighteenth of December. Previous to the evacuation, however, eighteen French ships of the line, nine frigates, and several smaller vessels, were either destroyed or secured;—and it is extremely to be lamented, that, from a want of

proper vigour and foresight, the total destruction of the port, and of all the vessels and stores which it contained, did not take place.*. Here, as at Lyons, the loyal inhabitants were butchered, by hundreds, in cold blood; Buonaparte, who commanded the artillery during the siege, under General Dugommier, is said to have presided at these barbarous massacres;—the Conventional Commissioners, in the South, Ricord, Freron, the younger Robespierre, and Salicetti, in announcing the evacuation to the Convention, observed, that their first dispatch should be dated "*from the ruins of Toulon*;" and the Convention passed a decree on the 24th of December, on the motion of Barrere, for changing the name of that *rebellious* city to *Port Mountain*, and for levelling all the houses which it contained with the ground; leaving nothing standing but the naval and military establishments. Pondicherry, and all the French settlements in the East, were reduced

* The scene which took place at the evacuation of Toulon was most horrible; the Royalists, men, women, and children, flocking down to the harbour, and intreating to be saved from the fury of the sanguinary Jacobins;—Almost every ship was crowded with these victims of loyalty. One only disgraceful exception to the humanity, generally displayed by the British officers, occurred;—while all the other boats were filled with Royalists; *one* is said to have been stowed with *wine*, to the exclusion of the unhappy supplicants.

by the British arms; and the island of Tobago, in the West Indies, besides some other possessions of less importance, were likewise wrested from their power.

While France was thus pressed by her enemies abroad, she was a prey to much more formidable and destructive enemies at home.—The struggle between the Girondists and the Jacobins had become more serious by the revolt of Dumouriez. Robespierre openly charged the Girondists with being his accomplices;—and though he was foiled in this attempt by the superior eloquence of Brissot, he renewed his attacks on other points, and, for some time, nothing was heard in the Convention but crimination and recrimination; and that Assembly, in fact, became an arena in which the battles of these political gladiators were fought. Victory was, at one period, doubtful; the Girondists had a decided advantage over their adversaries, both in *arguments* and in *facts*; and, by the aid of these, they succeeded for a while, not only in defeating every effort of Robespierre to persuade the Convention to bring them to trial, but in turning the tide of indignation against their accusers. In his address to his constituents, published early in 1793, Brissot drew a true picture of France, after the murder of the King; he represented, in strong, but just colours, the

tyranny exercised by the Parisian Commune, by the Jacobin Clubs, and the miscreants posted in the galleries of the Convention for the purpose of over-awing the deputies, and for destroying the freedom of debate. In short, he exhibited his country as under the joint dominion of terror and anarchy: "The laws without execution;—the constituted authorities impotent and disgraced;—crimes unpunished;—property of every kind attacked;—personal safety violated;—the morals of the people corrupted;—no constitution;—no government;—no justice!" Such was that stupendous monument of human wisdom, and of human happiness, which was held up to the admiration and imitation of surrounding nations, as it presented itself, four years subsequent to its erection, to the sight of one of its original founders!

Such was the unfortunate situation of this chief of the Girondists at that critical period, that every bold truth which he uttered supplied some damning evidence of his own guilt. The artifices which he then censured, and the injustice which he then condemned, were the very same to which he and his perfidious associates had formerly had recourse for the destruction of the Throne, and the deposition of the Monarch. It was not one of the least remarkable of the signal instances of retribu-

tive justice with which the history of the French revolution abounds, and all of which should be preserved as pregnant with awful and salutary lessons to future generations, that the Brissotins were now destined to be fought with their own weapons, to be opposed with their own principles, to be foiled with their own arguments, and to be caught in their own toils! Camille Desmoulins, a tried jacobin, and a furious orator at the clubs, was the person to whom the task of answering Brissot's address was entrusted.—Nor could jacobin ingenuity have discovered a more fit agent for the purpose. Desmoulins, who had been bred to the bar, and educated at the same college with Robespierre, was a hardened traitor, who artfully contrived, in his harangues, to mingle a small portion of truth with an infinite deal of falsehood, and whom no consideration of consequences could ever restrain from the accomplishment of his purposes; who disdained remorse as the puny offspring of superstition;—who enjoyed anarchy, and delighted in blood. His outset in life afforded a strong earnest of his future fame,—for the first speech he made at the bar was against his own father, whose prophetic spirit foretold he would perish on the scaffold. In a sanguinary paper which he conducted, he styled himself the *Attorney-General of the Lamp-Iron*;—and he

took a principal part in all the bloody scenes of the revolution. He was first in the interest, and probably in the pay, of the Duke of Orleans, who is said, at one time, to have promised him, as the reward of his zeal, the hand of Pamela, who afterwards married Lord Edward Fitzgerald. He was courted, too, by La Fayette, at whose house he frequently visited. He was one of those who formed the plan, and regulated the execution, of the massacres of September; in a conversation with Danton, on the subject, previous to the time fixed for their perpetration, he observed, "The innocent shall not be confounded with the guilty; all those prisoners whom *the sections* may claim shall be spared." And, after the horrid scene was over, the atrocious assassin remarked, with cold-blooded indifference, "Well, every thing was transacted *with all possible order;* the people even liberated many aristocrats!"* In short, Desmoulins vied with Robespierre himself for pre-eminence of guilt.

In his attack on the Brissotins, which was first delivered at the jacobin club, and afterwards printed by their order, and circulated throughout France, he makes the following preliminary

* This curious conversation with Danton is inserted in the *Histoire generale et impartiale, des erreurs, des fautes, et des crimes commis pendant la Révolution Française, par Prudhomme.*

observation, "There is little candour in asking us for facts to prove a conspiracy. The only trace which memory yet preserves of the famous harangues of Brissot and Gensonné, in which they attempted to prove the existence of the Austrian committee, is the principle laid down in them, 'That, in conspiracies, it is absurd to 'call for demonstrative facts and judicial 'proofs: that in no time have they ever been 'obtained, not even in the conspiracies of Cati-'line; for conspirators are not wont to be so 'unguarded in their conduct; it is sufficient that strong probabilities exist.' If so, then will I prove against Brissot and Gensonné the existence of an Anglo-Prussian committee, by circumstances a hundred times stronger than those by which Brissot and Gensonné proved the existence of an Austrian committee."*

This *argumentum ad hominem* it was not easy for the Girondists to refute; but the jacobins resolved to employ against them a more

* *The History of the Brissotins*, &c. p. 4. It was in this tract that Camille Desmoulins represented it as the duty of the Convention "To create the French Republic; to disorganize Europe; perhaps, to purge it of its tyrants, by the eruption of the volcanic principles of equality;" p. 2. and admitted that the jacobins "dragged a King of France to the scaffold, *because he was a King!*" P. 56. And, that "in the person of Louis XVI. they executed all Kings in effigy." P. 57.

powerful instrument than the pen.—They justly deemed the poniard more secure, and they resolved to destroy, by murder, the opponents whom they could not subdue by reason. Insurrections were raised to alarm the feeble adherents of the opposite faction; the Convention itself was insulted and threatened; and, on the 2d of June, when the last blow was to be stricken, it was surrounded by a band of five thousand ruffians, inflamed with liquor, and further stimulated by a pecuniary reward of one hundred livres each;—to the clamours of these men the Convention yielded the required victims, and hastily passed a decree by which all the chief leaders of the Brissotins, to the number of twenty-two, besides the commission of twelve (with only two exceptions) the ministers, Clavière and Le Brun, were put under arrest: three of these, however, Ducos, Dussaulx, and Lanthenas, were, through the intercession of Marat, erased from the fatal list of proscription.

No sooner was the Brissotin faction thus crushed by the superior power of the Jacobins, than the latter gave full vent to their rage, and established, from one end of the country to the other, the infernal system of terror. On the 24th of June, another New Constitution was presented to the Convention, which was afterwards accepted by the people, displaying about as much

wisdom as marked its predecessors, and destined to subsist for about the same length of time. Every refinement of cruelty, every extreme of vexation, which the ingenuity of low minds, harassed by personal fear, and intoxicated with ill-gotten power, could devise, were practised upon the unhappy people, who were now doomed to be governed by the very dregs of society.—Domestic peace was invaded, and domestic comfort destroyed, by visits from the innumerable officers of the revolutionary police, at all hours of the day and night; while all confidence was annihilated, and universal mistrust prevailed. It seemed the business of legislators to invent new crimes for punishment, while they allowed all others to escape with impunity. To be *suspected* was to be *criminal* in the eyes of those new philosophers, who, with very few exceptions, suspected, and most justly, each other. *Aristocracy* was another revolutionary crime, amounting to nothing less than treason against the sovereignty of the people; and a decent coat, a powdered head, or the use of the proscribed terms, *Sir* and *Madam*, was deemed a sufficient proof of its existence.

While a more horrible tyranny than had ever yet been witnessed since the creation of the world was thus established over the whole people of France, by men who had ruined their

country, in the name of liberty, it was not to be expected that foreigners would escape the general proscription.—Englishmen were marked as particular objects of vengeance and oppression. Mr. Pitt was deemed worthy of peculiar notice.—To him was ascribed every evil which afflicted the country, and every defeat which her armies sustained.—He was boldly affirmed to be the soul of every popular movement; and to employ more spies than the revenue of England would have paid.—It was accordingly decreed, by a solemn resolution of the Convention, adopted on the motion of Garnier,—that *Pitt was an enemy of the human race.*—The members, however, refused to assent to Garnier's proposition, that every man had a right to assassinate him;—though they did not scruple to denounce the English government, in the name of outraged humanity, to all nations, for its base, perfidious, and atrocious, conduct, in subsidizing assassination, poison, conflagration, and all other crimes, in order to promote the triumph of tyranny, and to annihilate the rights of man.—Certainly Mr. Pitt, by his able exposure of the mischievous tendency of their doctrines, and of the glaring infamy of their conduct, merited their resentment; but, though their praise was sufficient to pollute the character of any one on whom

it was bestowed, their hatred was incapable of conferring either honour or distinction on its object. But the ferocious governors of France did not confine themselves to vain resolutions and impotent threats.—In the course of the Autumn, laws were made, in virtue of which every foreigner was thrown into prison; and even the claims of those Englishmen who had hastened to regenerated France in search of greater liberty than could be found in their native land, and whose congratulations, on the success of the rebels and regicides of that country, had been duly mingled with libels on the governors of their own, were peremptorily rejected; and they were consigned to the same doom with those whom curiosity, business, or economy, had carried thither.

Early in the Spring, it was found that the ordinary tribunals of justice, though sufficiently pliant and complaisant, did not advance with rapidity enough to satisfy the ardent thirst for vengeance which the new executive government experienced. A new court, therefore, was established, which afterwards assumed the apt denomination of *the Revolutionary Tribunal!* Before this seat of iniquity, the unhappy Queen of France, who, since the murder of her illustrious consort, had dragged on a miserable existence, in the *Temple*, exposed to

every insult, and to every privation, which brutal malice could suggest to aggravate the severity of her fate, was destined to be brought. In July, by an order of the committee of public safety, she was forcibly separated from her son, who was consigned to the care of the vilest and most desperate of the Jacobins, one Simon, a cobler, who took a savage delight in making him drink spirituous liquors, and utter obscene and blasphemous expressions. On the first of August, this persecuted Princess was taken from her bed, at midnight, and transferred to the prison of the *Conciergerie*, where the most desperate villains were confined.—Here she remained, deprived even of common necessaries, and treated worse than the lowest of criminals, till the fourteenth of October, when she was brought before the Revolutionary Tribunal. Her trial, like that of the King, was a mockery of every thing which bore the semblance of justice;—not even the shadow of a proof was adduced of any one of the charges preferred against her; every thing that was absurd was mixed with every thing that was atrocious;—the very appearance of law and of decorum was rejected with disdain;—and the illustrious victim, having been exposed, for a certain time, to the irrelevant testimony of the witnesses, and to the stupid and captious inter-

rogatories of the judges, was consigned to the hands of the executioner. On the sixteenth of October, she was conveyed to the scaffold, in a coarse and dirty dress, seated on a tumbril.—She met her fate with the spirit and resignation of a Christian; and had the satisfaction to know, before she died, that her character had been completely vindicated from all the foul aspersions which had been cast upon it in the early periods of the revolution; by the utter inability of her enemies to substantiate any one fact against her, notwithstanding the most diligent inquiry; and although they were in possession of the whole power and wealth of the state, to protect and to reward any witness who would come forward in support of their allegations. The Duke of Orleans was executed soon after.—He was tried on the sixth of November, and sentenced to die for conspiring against the unity and indivisibility of the republic; almost the only crime of which he had not been guilty. He displayed great resolution in his last moments; but the universal execration in which he was holden rendered his execution a matter of exultation to every description of men.

Brissot and his associates had remained, during this time, under arrest at their own houses.—Their party was still thought to retain

sufficient influence to render their execution dangerous; but the Jacobins having, at length, by the complete establishment of the system of terror, confirmed their own power on a basis so solid as to secure it, in their apprehension at least, against any serious attack, they resolved to bring their humiliated opponents to a trial. In July, a committee was appointed, by the Convention, to draw up the articles of impeachment, not the least curious of which was that which charged them with an attempt to restore that very monarchy which they had, systematically, and, alas! too successfully, laboured to destroy. Even the murder of the inhuman incendiary, Marat, (who was stabbed by the hand of a young enthusiast,* on the thirteenth of July,) was imputed to them. It was not, however, deemed safe to try them till the 24th of October, when one-and-twenty of the Girondists; namely, Brissot, Vergniaud, Gensonné, Duperret, Carra, Gardien, Valazé, Duprat, Sillery, Fauchet, Ducos, Boyer-Fonfrede, Lasource, Lesterpt-Beauvais, Duchatel, Mainvielle, Lacaze, Lehardi, Boileau, Antiboul, and Vigée, were carried before the new Revolutionary Tribunal. The ingenuity of these men easily puzzled the stupid ferocity of their

* Charlotte Cordaye.

judges; and, by their exposure of the folly of many of the charges, and of the fallacy of others, by pertinent questions, and apt remarks, they prolonged the trial, to the great amusement of the audience, but to the great disquietude of the Jacobins. The partiality with which the account of the trial was given in a print, supposed to be conducted by one of their friends, was made the subject of a formal complaint to the Jacobin Club, by Hebert, on the 27th of October; and the members *decreed*,—for they possessed, or, at least, exercised, a kind of co-ordinate power with the executive councils,—that the reports of the judicial proceedings should thenceforth be limited to the *Journal de la Montagne*, which was composed by Chabot, the Capuchin; and that they should be revised previous to their publication, by some of their own body. The length of the trial, when it had lasted five days, exhausted the patience of the Jacobins, who openly complained, that the Revolutionary Tribunal did not answer the end of its establishment, since it proceeded like an ordinary court, and tried conspirators against the state, as it tried ordinary criminals.—In order to obtain the immediate removal of an evil so glaring in itself, and so hostile to their views, they applied to the Convention, complaining that the tribunal

which they had created was still *subjected to forms dangerous to liberty.* — The obsequious legislators instantly gratified the wishes of the petitioners, and decreed, on the motion of Robespierre, that when a trial had lasted three days, the president of the tribunal should ask the jury if they were satisfied, and if they should answer in the affirmative, the trial should be at an end; leaving it, however, to the jury to declare that they were satisfied, if they should think proper so to do, at any earlier period of the trial. This decree brought the trial of the Girondists to a close;—they were all sentenced to death on the 30th of October, though many of them were not implicated in the evidence delivered;—and, notwithstanding their remonstrances on the iniquity of the proceeding, were all executed the following day.—Many other members of this party met a similar fate; some perished by their own hands; and others wandered about the land, like fugitives and outlaws, and either died from want, or fell by the hands of provincial executioners. — Their great enemy, Camille Desmoulins, did not long survive them; he fell a victim to the jealous and malignant hatred of Robespierre, in the ensuing spring;—and when he was asked his age, by the revolutionary judges, the miscreant blasphemously answered — "*The age of the*

Sans-culotte, Jesus Christ, when he died."—It was singular, that the crime for which he suffered was the same which had been imputed, *with equal truth,* to his great enemies, the Brissotins —an attempt to restore the monarchy!

Among the founders of the Revolution, who had essentially contributed to the deposition and murder of their Sovereign, and who now met the fate which they had, unwittingly, prepared for themselves, were the Ministers *Le-Brun* and *Claviere,* the former of whom was executed without a trial, while the latter anticipated the executioner by laying violent hands on himself; *Madame Roland,* who lived and died a philosopher of the new school; and her wretched husband, who survived her only to commit suicide; *Condorcet,* the Solon of the Revolution, who died a miserable death, exhausted by hunger and fatigue, in a damp dungeon, at Bourg; *Barnave,* who had applauded, with malignant pleasantry, the atrocious murders of Foulon and Berthier, and who was now murdered, in his turn, by the revolutionary tribunal, whose vile president, Dumas, he courageously branded, on his trial, as a *wicked wretch,* and *an infamous creature;* and, lastly, *Bailli,* the first mayor of modern Paris, who, as Mr. Burke most truly predicted, was literally " *trampled under the hoofs of a*

*swinish multitude,** for, on his way to the place of execution, (on the 23d of November) he was subjected to the grossest insults, and most brutal outrages, of that very mob whose violence he had encouraged, and whose evil passions he had inflamed and flattered—thus paying dearly for his ingratitude to his deserted Sovereign, whose favour he had enjoyed, and whose bounty he had experienced.

Such was the state of affairs on the Continent, and in Great Britain, in the Autumn of 1793;—a new scene had opened on the political and moral world; a new æra had commenced, pregnant with events of the first consequence to mankind; and destined to unfold principles, and to exhibit transactions and conduct, at variance with the settled notions and established maxims of the best and ablest of our ancestors; and subversive of every tenet, and destructive of every institution, which the experience of past times, or the wisdom of the present generation, had consecrated, strengthened, and confirmed.

* Mr. Burke's sentiments on the conduct of Bailli may be seen in a letter to me, dated Beaconsfield, March 7th, 1799, and annexed to the second edition of my Letter to the Earl of Lauderdale.

APPENDIX A.

No. I.

AN ACCOUNT of the Number of CRIMINALS executed in the City of London and County of MIDDLESEX, from the Year 1749 to the Year 1806, inclusive; shewing the Proportion in each Seven Years, and distinguishing Years of War from Years of Peace.

1749 .. 44		
50 .. 56		
1 .. 63	Years of Peace,	
2 .. 47		
3 .. 41	Average 43 5-7ths.	
4 .. 34		
5 .. 21		
—306		
6 .. 13		
7 .. 26		
8 .. 20	Years of War,	
9 .. 6		
1760 .. 10	Average 15 2-7ths.	
1 .. 17		
2 .. 15		
—107		
3 .. 32		
4 .. 31		
5 .. 26	Years of Peace,	
6 .. 20		
7 .. 22	Average 26.	
8 .. 27		
9 .. 24		
—182		
1770 .. 49		
1 .. 34		
2 .. 37	Years of Peace,	
3 .. 32		
4 .. 32	Average 382.	
5 .. 46		
6 .. 38		
—268		
7 .. 32		
8 .. 33	Years of War,	
9 .. 23		
Carried forward — — 863		

Brought forward 863		
1780 .. 50		
1 .. 40	Years of War,	
2 .. 45	Average 39 3-7ths.	
3 .. 53		
—276		
4 .. 56		
5 .. 97		
6 .. 50	Years of Peace,	
7 .. 92		
8 .. 25	Average 54 1-7th.	
9 .. 26		
1790 .. 33		
—379		
1 .. 34	} Years of Peace.	
2 .. 24		
3 .. 16		
4 .. 7	Years of War,	
5 .. 22		
6 .. 22	Aver. 20 4-7ths.	
7 .. 19		
—144		
8 .. 19		
9 .. 24	Years of War.	
1800 .. 19		
1 .. 14		
2 .. 10	Year of Peace.	
3 .. 9	Years of War,	
4 .. 8		
—103	Average for the last 7 Years, 11 6-7ths.	
5 .. 10		
6 .. 13		
— 23		
Total .. 1788		

It appears by this Account, that, during the seven years of peace which preceded the war of 1756, the number of criminals executed within the City of London and County of Middlesex, was very considerable, being on an average forty-three a year.

In the seven years of war which suceeded, they were reduced to about fifteen a year.

In the seven years which followed the peace of 1763, the numbers again increased, but not to more than twenty-six a year upon an average.

In the seven years which followed, from the year 1770 to 1776 inclusive, which was likewise a period of peace, the number further increased to thirty-eight a year.

From the year 1776 to the year 1783, a period during which the country was at war, first with America, and afterwards successively with France, Spain, and Holland, the number instead of decreasing as had been the case in the former war, still further increased, the average being, during these seven years, about thirty-nine a year.

From the year 1783 to the year 1790, a period of peace, the average continued increasing to fifty-four a year, and the years 1785 and 1787 were great beyond all former example.

From 1793, the year in which the existing Police Establishment was first instituted, to the present period, the numbers appear to have progressively diminished; till within the last seven years the average has not been twelve a year. This period has, with the exception of one intervening year of peace, been a period of war, but, during that year, though the militia was disbanded, some part of the army, and a considerable part of the navy reduced, the number of capital convicts do not appear to have increased. The example of the American war, and of the year 1802, are sufficient to prove that the increase of capital offences cannot be traced exclusively, or even principally, to the different operation of war or peace, though it is natural to suppose that the first may have some effect in diminishing, and the latter in increasing the number of them.

No II.—An Account of the Number of Criminals executed in the January, 1749, and the Thirty-first of December, 1806,

YEARS.	CRIMES.									
FROM 1749 TO 1771, BOTH YEARS INCLUSIVE.	Murder.	Burglary and Housebreaking.	Highway Robbery.	Horsestealing.	Forgery.	Coining.	Returning from Transportation	Defrauding Creditors.	VARIOUS—Shoplifting, &c.	Piracy.
Total - - -	72	118	251	22	71	10	22	3	109	..
1772	3	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	32	..
3	2	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	29	..
4	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	31	..
5	2	..	..	..	..	3	..	..	41	..
6	6	..	..	..	..	8	..	..	24	..
7	2	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	29	..
8	1	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	31	..
9	..	..	..	..	..	3	..	..	20	..
1780	1	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	25	..
1	1	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	38	..
2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	45	..
3	1	15	13	..	4	5	6	..	4	..
4	1	28	16	1	3	..	2	..	1	..
5	1	43	31	4	4	..	4	..	3	..
6	7	21	11	2	3	2	1	..	1	..
7	1	43	36	3	4	1	..	..	2	..
8	..	5	5	..	1	3	2	..	3	3
9	2	11	4	1	1	7	..	..	..	..
1790	5	6	8	..	3	4	..	..	2	5
1	3	7	16	3	2	..	..	..	2	..
2	2	8	3	1	2	..	1	..	5	..
3	..	8	5	..	2	..	..	..	..	..
4	..	2	3	..	1	..	..	..	1	..
5	1	5	5	..	6	..	1	..	..	..
6	5	6	..	2	4	..	1	..	1	..
7	4	1	5	..	5	2	..	..	..	..
8	2	4	..	..	7	1	..	..	..	1
9	3	4	3	..	8	..	..	..	..	..
1800	2	7	5	..	2	..	..	..	..	1
1	3	1	6	..	3	..	..	..	..	..
2	1	1	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..
3	2	..	2	..	2	..	..	..	..	..
4	..	..	..	2	4	..	..	..	..	..
5	1	1	..	..	2	1	..	..	..	.
6	1	..	..	..	5	..	1	..	..	..
Total - - -	139	345	428	41	151	58	41	3	26	10

City of London and County of Middlesex, between First Day of shewing the various Crimes of which they were convicted.

CRIMES.												
Rioting.	Cutting and Maiming.	Shooting at Persons.	Sodomy.	Obtaining Property under Charge of Unnatural Crime.	Forgery of, and uttering Bank Notes.	Personating, to obtain Prize-Money.	Stealing in a Dwelling House.	Assaulting and Robbing in a Dwelling House.	Stealing Letters from General Post Office.	Sinking a Ship to defraud Underwriters.	Rape.	Robbery on the River Thames.
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
22	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	3	2	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	5
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..
2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1
..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	1	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..
2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	2	..
..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	1	..
..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..
..	..	2	..	..	..	..	1	..	1	..	..	2
..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
..	..	..	..	..	1	1	..	3	..	1	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	1	1	..	..	1	..	..	..
..	..	..	1	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	1	1	..	..	2	..	1	..	..	..	..	..
..	1	..	1	2	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..
479	2	6	3	2	6	15	6	3	10	1	4	9

TOTAL EXECUTED IN EACH YEAR.

1749	.. .. ..	44	
50	.. .. ..	56	
1	.. .. ..	63	
2	.. .. ..	47	
3	.. .. ..	41	
4	.. .. ..	34	
5	.. .. ..	21	
		—306	
6	.. .. ..	13	
7	.. .. ..	26	
8	.. .. ..	20	
9	.. .. ..	6	
1760	.. .. ..	10	
1	.. .. ..	17	
2	.. .. ..	15	
		—107	
3	.. .. ..	32	
4	.. .. ..	31	
5	.. .. ..	26	
6	.. .. ..	20	
7	.. .. ..	22	
8	.. .. ..	27	
9	.. .. ..	24	
		—182	
1770	.. .. ..	49	
1	.. .. ..	34	
		678	
1772	.. .. ..	37	
3	.. .. ..	32	
4	.. .. ..	32	
5	.. .. ..	46	
6	.. .. ..	38	
		—268	
	Carried over ..	268	

	Brought over ..	268
7	.. .. ..	32
8	.. .. ..	33
9	.. .. ..	23
1780	.. .. ..	50
1	.. .. ..	40
2	.. .. ..	45
3	.. .. ..	53
		—276
4	.. .. ..	56
5	.. .. ..	97
6	.. .. ..	50
7	.. .. ..	92
8	.. .. ..	25
9	.. .. ..	26
1790	.. .. ..	33
		—379
1	.. .. ..	34
2	.. .. ..	24
3	.. .. ..	16
4	.. .. ..	7
5	.. .. ..	22
6	.. .. ..	22
7	.. .. ..	19
		—144
8	.. .. ..	19
9	.. .. ..	24
1800	.. .. ..	19
1	.. .. ..	14
2	.. .. ..	10
3	.. .. ..	9
4	.. .. ..	8
		—103
5	.. .. ..	10
6	.. .. ..	13
		— 23
	Total..	1788

As in the year 1780 the books at Newgate were destroyed, it has not been possible to make up this Account for the early period, in as much detail as could have been wished. It is material to observe likewise, that from the year 1772 to the year 1783, the crimes of burglary, highway robbery, horse-stealing, and forgery, will be found confounded together under the column of VARIOUS, &c.

THE result of this Account appears to be, that the number of murders from the year 1771 to the present period, have remained nearly the same, but that they were considerably more, upon an average, in the twenty years preceding. A most important change, however, has taken place respecting the crimes of burglary and highway robbery. Those offences in their aggravated character, in which it is found necessary to apply capital punishment to them, have nearly disappeared within the County of Middlesex.

No. III.—An ACCOUNT of the Number of Criminal Offenders, committed to the several Gaols of England and Wales for Trial, in the Years 1805 and 1806, together with the Result of the Commitment.

COMMITTED in the Years	1805	1806
Viz. Males	3267	3120
Females	1338	1226
Total	4605	4346
CRIMES, viz.		
Sedition	4	..
Murder	26	24
(*Females*) of the murder of their infants, or concealing their births	27	36
Manslaughter	50	57
Cutting and maiming persons	21	8
Shooting at persons	14	7
Piracy, and felony on the High Seas	.	3
Sodomy, and other unnatural crimes	15	42
Obtaining property from persons, by threatening to charge them with an unnatural crime	..	2
Rape, (and attempt at)	38	48
Coining	15	10
Uttering bad money	108	84
Forgery	30	34
Ditto of Bank-notes, uttering, and having in their possession	28	15
Personating seamen and others, to obtain prize money, &c.	..	8
Arson	13	7
Burglary and housebreaking	130	124
Highway robbery	63	52
Horse-stealing	65	53
Sheep-stealing	71	60
Stealing cows, pigs, &c.	38	49
Larceny from the house, person, &c.	3555	3386
Receiving stolen goods	137	110
Fraud, conspiracy, &c.	94	94
Bigamy	23	22
Returning from transportation	15	11
	4605	4346

SENTENCES, &c. in the Years	1805	1806
* Death	350	325
Transportation for 14 years	34	26
Ditto 7 years	561	496
† Imprisonment for the space of 4 years	1	..
Ditto 3 years	4	4
Ditto 2 years, and above 1	123	100
Ditto 1 year, and above 6 months	333	294
Ditto 6 months, and under	1219	1158
Whipping, and fine	105	81
† and severally to be whipped, pilloried, kept to hard labour, fined, and given security, &c.		
Tried and acquitted	1092	1065
Discharged, (*no Bill being found, and for want of prosecution*)	730	7
Discharged to serve in the army and navy	53	31
* EXECUTED	68	57

Viz. for	M.	F.	M.	F.
Murder	5	3	5	0
——— of their infants	0	2	0	0
Cutting & maiming persons	1	0	3	0
Shooting at persons	1	0	2	0
Sodomy	0	0	0	0
Rape	5	0	2	0
Obtaining property from persons, by threatening to charge them with an unnatural crime	0	0	2	0
Forgery	6	0	11	0
Ditto of, and uttering, Bank-notes	6	1	0	0
Personating seamen and others, to obtain prize money, &c.	0	0	2	0
Coining	3	0	3	1
Arson	2	0	0	0
Burglary and housebreaking	5	0	6	0
Stealing in a dwelling house	2	0	1	1
Highway robbery	4	0	3	0
Horse-stealing	7	0	4	0
Sheep-stealing	5	0	3	0
Cattle-stealing	0	0	1	0
Return. from transportation	0	0	1	0

No. III.—*Continued.*

NUMBER COMMITTED in each County.

In the Years	1805.		1806.		In the Years	1805.		1806.	
	Mal.	Fem.	Mal.	Fem.		Mal.	Fem.	Mal.	Fem.
					Brought over..	1022	263	1017	260
Anglesea.....	1	0	3	0	Lancaster.....	206	165	227	124
Bedford.....	17	3	15	5	Leicester.....	33	14	24	8
Berks.....	50	12	29	13	Lincoln.....	44	14	49	15
Brecon.....	3	4	10	2	Merioneth.....	0	0	1	0
Bucks.....	29	4	36	4	Middlesex.....	732	485	700	432
Cambridge..	36	4	19	7	Monmouth.....	14	6	12	5
Cardigan.....	2	0	5	2	Montgomery....	10	5	10	5
Carmarthen..	5	3	10	6	Norfolk.....	114	49	88	31
Carnaervon...	4	2	1	0	Northampton....	35	7	42	16
Chester.....	56	24	87	14	Northumberland.	18	20	21	18
Cornwall.....	35	10	35	8	Nottingham....	60	14	51	19
Cumberland..	9	0	9	3	Oxford.....	34	4	26	8
Denbeigh....	2	0	4	0	Pembroke.....	7	5	2	3
Derby.....	34	5	33	5	Radnor.....	3	3	0	1
Devon.....	69	27	105	27	Rutland.....	4	0	3	5
Dorset.....	28	10	34	10	Salop.....	59	20	44	22
Durham.....	22	5	19	10	Somerset.....	79	27	81	24
Essex.....	127	17	101	17	Stafford.....	67	24	72	21
Flint.....	3	1	1	2	Suffolk.....	96	13	99	19
Glamorgan....	10	5	10	2	Surrey.....	147	52	134	57
Gloucester....	81	23	66	18	Sussex.....	93	12	50	12
Bristol.....	27	10	38	14	Warwick.....	120	40	89	41
Hants.....	105	42	106	41	Westmoreland..	4	2	5	1
Hereford.....	29	2	32	9	Wilts.....	61	14	63	9
Herts.....	36	7	46	6	Worcester.....	44	7	51	16
Huntingdon..	13	2	9	2	York.....	181	64	159	54
Kent.....	169	41	151	33					
					Total..	3267	1338	3120	1226
Carried over..	1022	263	1017	260					

THE Result of this Account appears to be, that the number of offenders in the County of Middlesex, are more than one-fourth of the whole; and that the number in proportion to the population in the counties most contiguous to London, are nearly double the number in the same population in the more remote counties.

No. IV.—AN ACCOUNT of the Population of each County, according to the Population Returns; the Number of Offenders committed within the same respectively, in the Year 1805; together with the Amount of Paupers in each County, and the Number of them in each Hundred of the Population, arranged according to the Circuits of the Judges.

NORTHERN CIRCUIT.

COUNTIES.	Population.	Offenders.	Paupers.	Number of Paupers in each Hundred of Population.
Yorkshire.....	858,892	245	77,661	9
Durham.....	160,361	27	15,307	10
Northumberland.	157,101	38	14,304	9
Cumberland....	117,230	18	8,443	7
Westmoreland...	41,617	6	4,615	11
Lancaster.....	672,731	371	46,200	7
	2,007,932	705	166,530	being an Average of 8 Paupers in each Hundred in the Northern Circuit.

MIDLAND CIRCUIT.

Northampton....	131,757	42	20,534	16
Rutland.....	16,356	4	1,338	8
Lincoln.....	208,557	58	18,845	9
Nottinghamshire.	140,350	74	9,806	7
Derbyshire.....	161,142	39	13,167	8
Leicestershire....	130,081	47	19,154	15
Warwickshire...	208,190	160	30,200	15
	996,433	424	113,044	Average 11.

NORFOLK CIRCUIT.

Bucks.....	107,444	33	19,050	18
Bedfordshire....	63,393	20	7,276	11
Huntingdonshire.	37,568	15	4,746	13
Cambridgeshire..	89,346	40	11,294	13
Suffolk.....	210,431	109	36,110	17
Norfolk.....	273,371	163	42,707	16
	781,553	380	121,783	Average 15.

OXFORD CIRCUIT.

Berks.....	109,215	62	22,088	21
Oxfordshire.....	109,020	38	21,025	20
Worcestershire..	139,330	51	18,896	13
Staffordshire....	239,153	91	22,510	9
Shropshire.....	167,639	79	17,306	10
Herefordshire....	89,190	31	11,779	13
Gloucestershire..	250,809	141	36,904	15
Monmouth.....	45,582	20	4,479	10
	1,150,538	513	154,987	Average 13.

No. IV.—*continued.*

WESTERN CIRCUIT.

COUNTIES.	Population.	Offenders.	Paupers.	Number of Paupers in each Hundred of Population.
Hampshire.....	219,656	147	32,581	15
Wiltshire.....	185,107	75	42,128	23
Dorsetshire.....	115,319	38	15,783	14
Devonshire.....	343,001	96	43,674	13
Cornwall.....	188,269	45	12,853	7
Somersetshire...	273,750	106	33,979	12
	1,325,102	507	180,998	Average 14.
	HOME CIRCUIT.			
Essex.....	226,437	144	38,337	17
Hertfordshire....	97,577	43	13,349	14
Sussex.....	159,311	105	37,076	23
Kent.....	307,624	210	41,632	13
Surrey.....	269,043	199	36,138	13
	1,059,992	701	166,532	Average $15\frac{3}{4}$.
Chester.....	191,751	80	22,152	$11\frac{1}{2}$
North Wales....	252,785	28	28,131	} 9
South Wales...	288,761	50	23,384	}
Middlesex.....	818,129	1,217	63,173	$7\frac{1}{2}$
TOTAL..	8,877,976	4,605	879,182	

THE Observation which naturally occurs on an Examination of this Account, is, the very great Advantage which the Northern Counties appear to possess, both with respect to the small Number of Offenders and Paupers, when compared with the rest of England. This Observation applies, not only to the Counties within the Northern Circuit, but likewise as far as relates to Paupers generally, to all the more Northern Counties. The Counties of Lincoln, Nottingham, Derby, and Rutland, and the most Northern Counties in the Midland Circuit, and those of Staffordshire and Shropshire, the most Northern in the Oxford Circuit, appear to be in this respect, in the same comparatively favorable Situation as the Counties within the Northern Circuit, when compared with the other more Southern Counties of England, Middlesex, Monmouth, and Cornwall, alone excepted.

APPENDIX B.

Proclamation for the preventing of tumultuous meetings and seditious writings, May 21.

By the KING. A PROCLAMATION.

GEORGE R.

Whereas divers wicked and seditious writings have been printed, published, and industriously dispersed, tending to excite tumult and disorder, by endeavouring to raise groundless jealousies and discontents in the minds of our faithful and loving subjects, respecting the laws and happy constitution of government, civil and religious, established in this kingdom: and endeavouring to vilify, and bring into contempt, the wise and wholesome provisions made at the time of the glorious revolution, and since strengthened and confirmed by subsequent laws, for the preservation and security of the rights and liberties of our faithful and loving subjects; and whereas divers writings have also been printed, published, and industriously dispersed, recommending the said wicked and seditious publications to the attention of all our faithful and loving subjects: and whereas we have also reason to believe, that correspondences have been entered into with sundry persons in foreign parts, with a view to forward the criminal and wicked purposes above-mentioned: and whereas the wealth, happiness, and prosperity of this kingdom do, under Divine Provi-

dence, chiefly depend upon a due submission to the laws, a just confidence in the integrity and wisdom of Parliament, and a continuance of that zealous attachment to the government and constitution of the kingdom, which has ever prevailed in the minds of the people thereof: and whereas there is nothing which we so earnestly desire, as to secure the public peace and prosperity, and to preserve to all our loving subjects the full enjoyment of their rights and liberties, both religious and civil. We, therefore, being resolved, as far as in us lies, to repress the wicked and seditious practices aforesaid, and to deter all persons from following so pernicious an example, have thought fit, by the advice of our privy council, to issue this our royal proclamation, solemnly warning all our loving subjects, as they tender their own happiness, and that of their posterity, to guard against all such attempts, which aim at the subversion of all regular government within this kingdom, and which are inconsistent with the peace and order of society; and earnestly exhorting them at all times, and to the utmost of their power, to avoid and discourage all proceedings tending to produce riots and tumults. And we do strictly charge and command all our magistrates, in and throughout our kingdom of Great Britain, that they do make diligent enquiry, in order to discover the authors and printers of such wicked and seditious writings as aforesaid, and all others who shall disperse the same: and we do further charge and command all our sheriffs, justices of the peace, chief magistrates in our cities, boroughs, and corporations, and all other our officers and magistrates throughout our kingdom of Great Britain, that they do, in their several and respective stations, take the most immediate and effectual care to suppress and prevent all riots, tumults, and other disorders, which may be attempted to be raised or made by any person or persons, which, on whatever pretext they may be grounded, are not only contrary to the law, but dangerous to the most important interests of this kingdom: and we do further require and command all and every our

magistrates aforesaid, that they do, from time to time, transmit to one of our principal secretaries of state, due and full information of such persons as shall be found offending as aforesaid, or, in any degree, aiding or abetting therein; it being our determination, for the preservation of the peace and happiness of our faithful and loving subjects, to carry the laws vigorously into execution against such offenders as aforesaid.

Given at our court at the Queen's House, the 21st day of May, 1792, in the thirty-second year of our reign.

GOD save the KING.

APPENDIX C.

Translation of a Letter from General Dumouriez to Lord Auckland, the British Ambassador at the Hague.

Paris, January 23d, 1793.

My Lord,

The French Minister at the Hague, and my sincere friend, M. de Maulde, has informed me, that, in several conferences with M. Van de Spieghel, and himself, you testified your esteem and particular consideration for me, which I shall ever take care to deserve by my moral conduct. The Grand Pensionary expressed the same sentiments.

As I am about to visit the quarters of my army, I shall be in the neighbourhood of Holland for some days. Would it not be possible, from a conference on the frontiers, either between you and me, or in the presence of M. Van Spieghel, to produce results useful to England, to the United Provinces, to France, to Humanity, and, perhaps, to all Europe.

I submit this proposal to your prudence, and to your love of peace, which every man of integrity ought to find at the bottom of his heart. On the 30th of this month, I shall be at Antwerp, where I will wait two days for your answer.

I beg you to be persuaded that I am, with the same sentiments for you with which you honour me,

My Lord,
Your Servant,
And the friend of the
English nation,
DUMOURIEZ.

To his Excellence, My Lord Auckland,
The English Ambassador
at the Hague.

END OF VOL. III.

G. SIDNEY, Printer,
Northumberland-street, Strand.

ERRATA TO VOL. III.

Page	7,	line 12, for "publications," read publication.
——	30,	— 25, for "parts," read points.
——	59,	— 7, from the bottom, for "Pilnitz," read Pilnitz.
——	67,	— 4, dele comma after "legal."
——	78,	— 4, for "were," read was.
——	103,	— 17, for "object," read objects.
——	120,	— 10, insert *and* before "for."
——	144,	— 5, after "credit," insert *for*.
——	147,	— 11, for "pulic," read pu lic.
——	161,	note, line 2, from the bottom, for "six," read eight.
——	162,	note, line 5, for "confuted," read confined.
——	180,	line 13, for "captivating," read courting.
——	——	— 19, for "serious, and," read series of.
——	181,	— 3, from the bottom, for "prosecution," read proclamation.
——	189,	— 7, dele "afterwards."
——	202,	— 10, for "Dietines," read Dietines.
——	248,	— 4, for "*sources*," read fidelity.
——	249,	note, last line, for "Citizen," read Citoyen.
——	257,	last line, for "*its*," read their.
——	273,	line 8, for "sprung," read sprang.
——	361,	— 4, after "but," insert *they*.
——	490,	— 10, for "Mideterranean," read Mediterranean.

00037271

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 03 December, 2015